Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division SCC
Section 1481
Shelf ..... Number .....

THE

BULWARK STORMED:

In Answer to

THOMAS DE LAUNE'S

Plea for the Non-Conformists.

Wherein is shewed

The Fallaciousness and Unconclusiveness of every Argument in that PRETENDED UNANSWERABLE BOOK.

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

By *EDWARD HART.*

WITH A

LETTER to the AUTHOR,

In Vindication of the Primitive Church, and the Church of ENGLAND, from the Corruptions which the said *Thomas De Laune* has falsly charged upon them.

By the Reverend Dr. BRETT.

LONDON:

Printed for W. INNYS at the *Prince's Arms* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1717.

Dr. BRETT's *Letter to the Author, in Vindication of the* PRIMITIVE CHURCH, *&c.*

Mr. HART,

I Never heard of *De Launc*'s Plea till you brought it me, and told me that it was a Book which was much cried up by the *Diſſenters*, who ſaid it neither had been nor could be anſwer'd. And I find that Mr. *De Foe* alſo repreſents it as unanſwerable. He tells us in his Preface, *p.* 15. That *the Book is perfect in it ſelf; never Author left behind him a more finiſh'd Piece; and that he believes the Diſpute is entirely ended. If any Man ask what they can ſay, why the* Diſſenters *differ from the Church of* England, *and what they can plead for it? He can recommend no better*

Reply than this, Let them answer, in short, Thomas De Laune; *and desire the Querist to read the Book.* I therefore read it over carefully, and found it to be what I expected, *a Treatise written with some Art and Sophistry, but without one good Argument that would bear the Test.* However, considering your Education and Employment, I feared (being then a Stranger to you) that you was not qualified to give this Book a solid Answer. But I had not read many Leaves of your *Bulwark Storm'd* before I was convinc'd, that good Sense and a sound Understanding are by no means confined to Men of a liberal Education; and it having pleas'd God to bless you with those Talents, together with an honest Mind, you had not failed to make a good Improvement of them, notwithstanding your low station in the World had barred you from those Advantages which Men of a learned Education and easier Fortunes enjoy. And I found that you had not only read, but throughly understood and digested our best *English* Authors, and had thereby so well acquainted your self with the Grounds and Principles of true Religion, that you could easily see through all the Sophisms and Fallacies of *DeLaune*'s Arguments, and set them in a plain Light, so as to make them obvious to the most vulgar Readers; though you had not Learning and Opportunities to enquire into the Fairness of his Quotations from ancient Authors, or to examine whether those Ceremonies which he charges with Novelty were so or not. Give me leave therefore to shew you, that he has been been very unfair in his Representations of the true *Primitive Church*, and many other Matters, which you have not observed in your Answer. Not but I think

I think you have sufficiently confuted *De Laune*'s Arguments, and shewed that they cannot stand, whether these things are true or false. But that I may vindicate the *Primitive Church*, and our own, from those Calumnies he so unjustly loads them with, and shew that this Fellow, who pretended to be a Scholar, was either egregiously ignorant, and knew not whether what he asserted was true or false, or else abominably impudent in endeavouring to impose upon the World what he knew to be false.

I shall begin with what he says concerning the primitive times, that is, those times of the Church which were within four hundred Years after the Birth of *Christ*. Now these were certainly the purest times of the *Christian* Church. The first hundred Years was under the Presidency of *Christ* himself here on Earth, or some of his Apostles; for St. *John*, the beloved Disciple, did not die till about an hundred Years after the Nativity of our Saviour. The next fifty Years, at least, was under the Presidency of such Bishops as had been instructed by the Apostles or apostolical Men; for the Apostles had many Assistants and Fellow-Labourers, whose Names we meet with in the New Testament, as *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Sylvanus*, *Epaphroditus*, *Clemens*, and others, who were as careful to preserve the Purity of the *Christian* Faith and Worship, as the Apostles themselves. And we have reason to believe that their immediate Successors, who were educated and ordained by them, would not immediately corrupt the Faith and Worship of God, and deviate from the apostolical Doctrine and Practice; especially when we consider that the Apostles, and apostolical Men their Contemporaries, had the Gift of discerning Spirits, and

therefore would not ſet any Men over the Church to govern it after their Deaths, whom they did not know to be found in the Faith, and very unlikely to corrupt that Doctrine and Worſhip which they had received from them. So that I think we may very well conclude that the Church was not corrupt whilſt it was under the Preſidency of the Apoſtles, or their immediate Succeſſors; that is, for an hundred and fifty Years after the Birth of *Chriſt*. Neither have we any reaſon to think that the Church was corrupted within the next hundred and fifty Years; for we find the Authors of thoſe times frequently appealing to the Doctrines and Practices deliver'd by the Apoſtles, and very zealous for the obſerving and retaining them pure and uncorrupt, and vigorouſly oppoſing all that would deviate from them. And in ſo ſhort a ſpace of time as an hundred and fifty, or two hundred Years, they could not but know what were the apoſtolical Practices. They could not but know what kind of Government the Apoſtles had ſettled in the Church, what Orders of Miniſters they had appointed, how and in what manner they adminiſtred Baptiſm, Confirmation, the Euchariſt, and ſuch like; what kind of Service they uſed in their ſolemn Aſſemblies, what Feaſts and Faſts they obſerved, or whether any at all. Theſe, and other matters of the ſame nature, they could not but know, as well as we can know what were the uſages of our firſt Reformers, who lived about the ſame diſtance of time from us that the Apoſtles and their immediate Succeſſors did, from thoſe who lived at the latter end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth Century. And foraſmuch as we find that the Church continued

the

the same Doctrine and Worship to the end of the fourth Century, and afterwards, which they observed in the beginning of that Century, of which we have a clear Account from the numerous Writers of that Age; we conclude with very good reason, that for these first four hundred Years after the Birth of *Christ*, that Church was as pure and uncorrupt as we can expect to find her in her militant State, and consequently that the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, in those first Ages, is the best Pattern we can have to complete and finish our Reformation. And though perhaps we may find some usages amongst them, which are not directly authorized by Scripture, yet we have no reason to doubt but that what was universally received and practised by the Church, within the Period I have mentioned, was derived from undoubted apostolical Tradition. For as St. *Augustin*, who lived about the latter end of this Period, observes, in one of his Books against the *Donatists*, *(De Baptism. lib. 4. cap. 24.) Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi Auctoritate apostolicâ traditum rectissime creditur. That which is holden and observed by the whole Church, and was not instituted by any Councils, but has been always retained, is most truly believed not to have risen from any other Authority than apostolical Tradition.* And therefore, as *Vincentius Lirinensis* observes, what has been taught and practised *in all Times*, *in all Places*, *and by all the Faithful*, is not to be esteemed corrupt and erroneous, though it be not particularly prescribed in the Holy Scriptures. For indeed, if we lay aside this Rule, how shall we know what is Scripture and what is not so? Let me

ask any Man, how he knows that the Books of St. *Matthew*, St. *Mark*, St. *Luke*, or St. *John*, were written by any of thoſe Apoſtles or Evangeliſts whoſe Names they bear, otherwiſe than by this moſt ancient and univerſal Tradition? And if they were not written by thoſe Perſons who lived and were converſant with *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, and therefore could not be deceived in what they wrote concerning him and them, how ſhall we know that they have given us a true account of the Life and Actions, the Paſſion and Death of our Saviour? Nay, how ſhall we know that the Epiſtles written by St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, St. *James*, St. *John*, and St. *Jude*, were not forged by other Men in their Names, without we allow this univerſal Tradition to be one good Proof of it? For the Holy Scripture's Teſtimony concerning it ſelf is not alone ſufficient, without this Conjunction of the univerſal Tradition of the Church. Thus, for inſtance, if the internal Teſtimony of a Book concerning it ſelf be ſufficient to command my belief and aſſent to it, why ſhould I believe the Book of the *Proverbs* to have been written by *Solomon*, and not the Book of *Wiſdom*. One bears the Name of *Solomon* no leſs than the other; and it is plain that the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom* writes as if he was *Solomon* the Son of *David*; and, if we may credit his own words, he could be no other. For, in his Prayer to God for Wiſdom, he ſays (*Wiſd.* ix. 7.) *Thou haſt choſen me to be a King of thy People, and a Judge of thy Sons and Daughters: Thou haſt commanded me to build a Temple on thy holy Mount, and an Altar in the City wherein thou dwelleſt.* If then we might depend upon the Teſtimony of this Book concern-

ing

ing it self, the Author of it could be no other than *Solomon* the Son of *David.* And there is nothing in the whole Book but what is agreeable to the undoubted canonical Scriptures. And it contains many excellent Precepts and Instructions: And for any thing that appears in the Book it self, I cannot see why it should be rejected as *Apocryphal.* But then we learn from the Tradition of the Church, that it was not written by *Solomon*, but by one *Philo* an *hellenistical Jew*, who lived about the time of the *Maccabees*; and therefore we justly reject it as a *Counterfeit.* But we could not have known that it was a *Counterfeit* merely by reading the Book it self, or from the Testimony of any other Scriptures, but only from the traditional Testimony of the Church, which has always rejected it as such. And therefore to disregard and contemn an universal Tradition, supported by the unanimous Testimony of *all Times*, *all Places*, *and all the Faithful*, will weaken the Authority even of the Scriptures themselves, and leave us no Rule to go by. And I freely confess, that if the Church of *Rome* could shew such an ancient and universal Tradition as I here plead for, in behalf of the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Prayers to Saints*, *Images*, &c. I would not call those Doctrines corrupt and erroneous. But being well assured that they want antiquity, and that direct contrary Doctrines, entirely inconsistent with them, were ever taught by the Fathers of the four (I may say the six) first Centuries, who were undoubtedly much better acquainted with the Traditions deriv'd from the Apostles, than we can be at this distance, otherwise than by their unanimous Testimony; I abominate and detest those, and

all

all other corrupt Doctrines of Popery, as Novelties and pernicious Errours. For I think the *Primitive Church* of the four first Centuries ought to be our Pattern, both for Doctrine and Discipline, for the Reasons already mentioned.

But *De Laune* says *(pag.* 19.) That *we find those very times abounding very much with Error and Superstition*; *which* (says he) *is an Argument we should not receive them for our Pattern more than others*; *whereof* (adds he) *I shall give you some Instances of their* Nævi, *or Errors mentioned by the* Centurists. And then he proceeds to tell us, that *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Austin*, *Constantine*, and *Chrysostom*, were corrupt. And suppose these Centurists, or *De Laune*, could have made their assertions good, and have proved these particular Men to have been corrupt, would it have followed that the Church was also corrupt in their times? Mr. *Whiston* and Dr. *Clark*, and for ought I know, many others that are now living, and not expelled from the Communion of the Church of *England*, are corrupt and professed *Arians*; does it therefore follow that the Church of *England* also is corrupted with *Arianism*, which is so directly contrary to her *Articles*, *Creeds*, and *Liturgy?* There have been and will be corrupt Men in all Ages; the Tares will grow up with the Wheat: But does it therefore follow that the Church it self is corrupt? There was a *Judas* amongst the twelve Apostles, even whilst our Saviour himself was on Earth conversant with them. There were false Prophets and false Teachers, who brought in damnable Heresies even in the Apostles Days; but was the apostolical Church, or the Church which was then under the Guidance and Government of the Apostles therefore corrupt?

corrupt? Or, to turn the Argument upon the Diſſenters themſelves: Is there any Party amongſt them that has no Men which hold corrupt Opinions? Are they all infallible, and free from Error? Will the Body of Diſſenters juſtify every thing that is to be found in the Books written by any Man of their Party? If we ſhould charge the Diſſenters with the Errors and Corruptions which may be found in ſome of their Authors Writings, would they not ſay to us, Let thoſe Men anſwer for themſelves; we hold no ſuch Doctrines; we will not defend their Miſtakes? Have they not written *Pro* and *Con*, one againſt another, as well as particular Men of the Church of *England?* Are they all of one accord, and of one mind? Some of them therefore muſt be miſtaken. But if they do not think it fair, that the Miſtakes of particular Men ſhould be charged upon all that communicate with them, with what Face can they put the Miſtakes of particular Men upon the whole Church? For *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *Conſtantine*, and *Chryſoſtome*, were no other than particular Men, who lived at different times one after another in the *Primitive Church:* For there were but two of them, *Auſtin* and *Chryſoſtome*, that were Contemporaries. So that if *De Laune* could have proved every one of theſe to have been corrupt and erroneous, yet this would have been no proof that the Church it ſelf in their times was ſo. However, foraſmuch as theſe were all of them Men of Eminency and Station in the Church, and whoſe Names have been venerable to this Day, I think it very proper to vindicate them from the aſperſions caſt upon them by *De Laune*.

He tells us, *That* Origen *aſſerted two* Chriſts, *denyed his Godhead, was the Head of the* Arians *and* Pelagians,

Pelagians, *holding* (as *Jerome* says) *very desperately concerning the Spirit, and very corruptly about Angels, Devils, Creation, Providence, original Sin, Church-Government, and the Resurrection and sacrificing for the Dead: Baptism takes away Sin, and that there must be a Baptism after the Resurrection.* But by the way, this very Charge of St. *Jerom* against *Origen* (if St. *Jerom* has charged him with all these Particulars) is an Argument that the Church was not altogether chargeable with such Opinions. For St. *Jerom* lived in the fourth Century, and therefore would not have charged *Origen* with heterodoxy, for holding such Opinions, if they had been the Opinions of the Church at that time. Therefore this very Charge of St. *Jerom* against *Origen* is sufficient to clear the Church from the Errors and Corruptions which he is accused of. But we are farther to consider, that St. *Jerom* lived near two hundred Years after *Origen*; and that before that time, as *Rufinus*, who lived at the same time with St. *Jerom*, informs us, many of *Origen*'s Books, which were very numerous, were corrupted by Hereticks; and many things foisted into them directly contrary to the Doctrines he had taught, and which were to be found in his undoubted genuine Works, which had not been interpolated. And particularly as to the first and capital Error with which *De Laune* charges him, *viz.* his *asserting two Christs, and denying his Godhead, and being the Head of the* Arians; it appears to be a very false Accusation, as the learned Bishop *Bull* has shewed *(Defens. Fid. Nicæn. Edit. per* Grabe, *p.* 107.) from *Origen*'s own undoubted Works, still extant. But nothing can better justify the Church in *Origen*'s time, and *Origen* himself, from

from this Calumny of *denying the Godhead of Chriſt*, than that the Church, as *Euſebius* informs us, *(Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib. 6. cap.* 33.) in a ſolemn Synod condemned that very Error, when *Beryllus* Biſhop of *Boſtra* in *Arabia* endeavour'd to introduce it; and *Origen* was the very Man who diſputed with *Beryllus* on that occaſion, and prevailed with him to repent of, and openly retract that wicked and heretical Opinion.

As to *Cyprian*, *De Laune* ſays that *he affirmed the Church of* Rome *to be the Mother-Church; that there ought to be one High-Prieſt over the Church; that the principal Church is* Peter's *Chair, from whence the Unity of the Prieſthood ariſeth; and that on* Peter *the Church is founded.* But let us hear St. *Cyprian*'s own words, and what his Sentiments were as to theſe Points, and then we ſhall ſee plainly that the Centuriſts, and *De Laune* from them, have very much miſrepreſented him. *Cyprian* then, not far from the beginning of his Book *Of the Unity of the Church*, has theſe words, "The Lord ſays unto *Peter* (Matth. xvi. 18.) "*Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build* "*my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not pre-* "*vail againſt it: And I will give unto thee the* "*Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatſoe-* "*ver thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in* "*Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on* "*Earth, ſhalt be looſed in Heaven.* And again "he ſays to him, after his Reſurrection *(Joh.* "xxi. 16.) *Feed my Sheep.* Upon him alone he "builds his Church, and commits the feeding of "his Sheep to him. And although after the "Reſurrection he gave to all the Apoſtles *an e-* "*qual Power*, and ſaid, *(Joh.* xx. 21.) *As my Fa-* "*ther hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you; receive the Ho-*

"*ly*

" *ly Ghoſt. Whoſeſoever Sins ye remit, they are* " *remitted unto them; and whoſeſoever Sins ye re-* " *tain, they are retained.* Yet that he might " manifeſt the Unity, he eſtabliſhed *one Chair*, " and ſettled the Original of that Unity by his " own Authority, beginning from one. *For the* " *other Apoſtles were the ſame that* Peter *was, in-* " *veſted with an equal ſhare both of Honour and* " *Power*; but the beginning proceeded from " Unity. The Primacy is given to *Peter*, to " demonſtrate the Church of *Chriſt* to be but " one. And all are Shepherds, but the Flock is " one, which is fed by all the Apoſtles with an " unanimous Conſent."

But what corrupt erroneous Doctrine is to be found in this, or perhaps other Paſſages of St. *Cyprian* to the ſame effect? He does indeed make St. *Peter*'s Chair the Principal of Unity to the Church. But does not the Scripture alſo do the ſame? For what is it that he calls by the Name of St. *Peter*'s Chair? Not the Pope's Chair, as *De Laune* would inſinuate, but the Commiſſion which was firſt given to *Peter*, and afterwards to *all* the Apoſtles. He allows to *Peter* no Pre-eminence above the reſt, but ſays they had all *parem Poteſtatem, an equal Power:* Only he ſays that *Peter* was the firſt to whom this Power was given; that he had the *Primatus*, the *Primacy* or Precedency in order of time; and ſo, as the eldeſt Apoſtle, the right Hand of Fellowſhip belonged to him. He received his Commiſſion firſt, but every one of the Apoſtles received the very ſame Commiſſion; they all ſat in one and the ſame Chair with him, and were all *pari conſortio præditi & Honoris & Poteſtatis, inveſted with an equal ſhare both of Honour and Power.* It was *one and*

and the same Apostolat, one and the same Episcopat, which was given to every one of them. And to this purpose St. *Cyprian* expresseth himself a little after, *Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur: There is one Episcopat, of which part is committed to every Bishop in full.* The word *in solidum*, or *in full*, is a Phrase of the *Roman* Law, and signifies here that part of this one Episcopat was so committed to every single Bishop, that he was likewise charged with a Care of the whole Church. And so he explains himself, (in his fifty fifth Epistle) *Cum sit Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa; ita Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate divisus: As there is one Church of Christ, distinguished into many Members through the whole World, so there is one Episcopat of a great united number of many Bishops, diffused through that one Church.* If then it was St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion, that *the Apostles were all equal*, and that *all Bishops were equal* likewise, as is so evident from his own words; and that he neither allowed that *Peter* had any greater share of Honour and Power than any other Apostle, or that any one Bishop had a superiority over the rest, it is evident that he could not affirm, as the *Centuriists*, and *De Laune* from them, tells us that he does, that *there ought to be one High-Priest over the Church*, if we understand him to speak of any mortal Man as that High-Priest; and if it be understood of *Christ*, I am sure it is neither corrupt nor erroneous. Neither does he make St. *Peter*'s Chair the *principal Church*, as it is to be understood of the Church of *Rome*, or any other particular Church; but by St. *Peter*'s Chair he plainly means the Chair of every one of the Apo-

ſtles, who, as he directly tells us, had *an equal Power* with St. *Peter:* For he does not ſay that *Chriſt* ſettled the Original of Unity in *Peter*, but only that he *began from him.* I might, if it was neceſſary, produce abundance of Paſſages from St. *Cyprian*, to ſhew that he was the fartheſt of any Man from maintaining or aſſerting the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* over other Biſhops; nor indeed did the Biſhop of *Rome* pretend to any ſuch Authority in thoſe early Days, or for ſome Ages after. And there is no Book of that Antiquity in the World, from whence ſo many Arguments may be drawn againſt the Papal Pretenſions to a Supremacy over the whole Church, as may be taken from the Works of St. *Cyprian.* So far is that Father from being corrupt or erroneous in that Point, as *De Laune* either ignorantly or impudently would inſinuate that he is.

But *De Laune* farther tells us, that he was *a violent Impugner of Prieſts Marriages.* But for my part I can find nothing like it, though I have pretty carefully examined his Works. He does indeed frequently commend Virginity, as St. *Paul* alſo does; but he forbids no Man to marry, whether Lay-Men or Prieſts. And it would be ſtrange if he ſhould, ſince he himſelf was a married Man, and lived with his Wife after he was a Prieſt, as well as before; as *Pontius* his Deacon, who lived with him, and wrote his Life, informs us: Which is a moſt certain Evidence that he did not think Prieſts Marriages to be unlawful; and if he did not, he ought not to be called a *violent Impugner* of them.

The next Corruption, with which he charges *Cyprian*, is, That he held that *Sins are done away by Alms and good Works.* And indeed St. *Cyprian*

prian has written a Book concerning *good Works and Alms*, wherein he ſhews how very uſeful and beneficial they will be to us; and ſpeaks of them as things neceſſary to be done, in order to the obtaining the Remiſſion of our Sins, and eternal Life. And whatever he ſays on this occaſion, he proves by expreſs Texts and Quotations from the holy Scriptures. Nor does he ſay that theſe things are capable of cleanſing us from our Sins, any otherwiſe than as they are done in Faith; that is, as they are done in Obedience to *Chriſt*, and a dependence and truſt for Pardon and Salvation through his Merits. For his words are, *Eleemoſynis & fide delicta purgantur: Sins are done away by Alms and Faith*; agreeable to that Text ſo frequently repeated in the Scripture, (*Hab.* ii. 4. *Rom.* i. 7. *Gal.* iii. 11. *Heb.* x. 38.) *The Juſt ſhall live by his Faith.* For who is to be called *juſt* or *righteous*, but he that does good Works, and gives Alms according to his Ability? The Scripture no where ſays that *the Wicked ſhall live by his Faith*; but the contrary. *What doth it profit*, ſays the Apoſtle, (*Jam.* ii. 14.) *though a Man ſay he hath Faith, and have not Works? Can Faith ſave him?* What is it then St. *Cyprian* ſays on this occaſion, which the Scripture does not ſay?

Well, but St. *Cyprian* ſays, *the Perſon baptizing, in the very act confers the Holy Spirit.* And I do confeſs that he does more than once uſe expreſſions, which imply that to have been his opinion. But I do not conceive him to have been corrupt and erroneous in it, becauſe I find it to have been the Doctrine taught by the Apoſtles, (*Acts* ii. 38.) *Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and ye ſhall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt.* From whence I

think it is very evident, that when Baptism is given and received duly and regularly as it ought to be; that is, where the Giver is duly qualifyed by *Christ*'s Commission to administer it; and there is no obstruction in the Receiver, either of Impenitence or Unbelief, the Holy Ghost is also given with it. For if the *Gift of the Holy Ghost* be a necessary consequence of good and effectual Baptism, as the Scriptures teach us that it is; then the Person who has a Commission from God to administer that Sacrament, may very well be said *ministerially to confer the Holy Spirit in the very Act of baptizing*; consequently St. *Cyprian* asserts no more than the Scriptures warranted him to do, and therefore ought not to be accused as corrupt and erroneous on this account.

But he farther tells us that *Cyprian* says, *that* Chrism *and* Exorcism *are absolutely necessary*. Now I do acknowledge that St. *Cyprian* does say that *Chrism* is necessary; but he does not say *absolutely* necessary, as *De Laune* charges him to do. And for *Exorcism*, he does not so much as say that it is necessary; but of that in the next place: We will first consider what he says of *Chrism*, which he speaks of in his LXX. Epistle directed to *Januarius* and the other Bishops of *Numidia*, and says, *Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus sit, ut accepto Chrismate, id est, Unctione esse unctus Dei, & habere in se Gratiam Christi possit. It is also necessary that he that has been baptized should be anointed, that having received the Chrism, that is, the Unction, he may be the Anointed of God, and have the Grace of Christ residing in him.* And what he here calls *Chrism* or *Unction*, he in his LXXII. Epistle directed

to

to *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome*, calls *Impoſition of Hands for the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt:* Which is that Ordinance which we now call by the name of *Confirmation.* Which being always adminiſtred from the Apoſtles Days down to the Reformation with the ceremony of Anointing, was therefore uſually called by the name of *Chriſm* or *Unction.* Now the ſaying that this Ordinance of *Confirmation* is neceſſary, is ſaying no more than the Scripture it ſelf warrants him to ſay, ſince it is numbred by St. *Paul* (*Heb.* vi. 1, 2.) amongſt the Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Religion. For ſpeaking of *the Foundation*, or thoſe Points of our Religion which are *neceſſary*, ſuch as *Repentance from dead Works*, *Faith towards God*, *the Reſurrection of the Dead*, *and eternal Judgment*, he adds to them not only the *Doctrine of Baptiſms*, but likewiſe of *Laying on of Hands.* If therefore St. *Paul* judged this Ordinance to be one of *the Foundations* of our Religion, as he expreſſly calls it, I cannot think St. *Cyprian* corrupt and erroneous for ſaying that it is *neceſſary:* For they both ſpeak of the ſame Ordinance, though one calls it the *laying on of Hands*, and the other calls it *Unction* or *Chriſm*, becauſe both thoſe Ceremonies were uſed in the Miniſtration of it. And therefore whether Oil was neceſſary or not to be uſed in this Ordinance, St. *Cyprian* was not corrupt or erroneous in ſpeaking of *Chriſm* as neceſſary, ſince that Ordinance in his time, and long before, even from the Apoſtles Days, was not adminiſtred without it. And I conceive there is more Reaſon to believe, that we our ſelves have been erroneous in laying aſide the Uſe of *Chriſm* or *Oil* in the Ordinance of *Confirmation*, than that he was erroneous in mentioning

tioning it as neceſſary. Much more have thoſe been corrupt and erroneous, who make *Confirmation* it ſelf not neceſſary; and have altogether laid aſide a Divine Ordinance which St. *Paul* places among the Fundamentals of our Religion.

As to *Exorciſms* which *De Laune* tells us St. *Cyprian* makes to be *abſolutely neceſſary*; I muſt ſay that he no where ſpeaks of them as *neceſſary:* He does indeed once, towards the end of his LXIX. Epiſtle directed to *Magnus*, mention the *Exorciſts* as Perſons that did caſt out Devils. And it is known to all that are acquainted with the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, that the *Chriſtians*, as well in St. *Cyprian*'s Age as before and after, did caſt out Devils from ſuch as were poſſeſſed: And they challenged the Heathen to put the matter to the Trial at any time, in order to convince them that the Gods which they worſhipped were no other than mere Devils. *Bring forth any Man*, ſays *Tertullian* in his Apology for the *Chriſtians* againſt the *Gentiles*, (*cap.* 23.) *who is poſſeſſed with a Demon, and place him before your own Tribunals: That Spirit being commanded by any* Chriſtian *to ſpeak, ſhall then as truly confeſs himſelf to be a Devil, as he falſly in another place pretends to be a God.———If they do not confeſs themſelves to be Devils, not daring to lie to a* Chriſtian, *then immediately ſhed the Blood of that impudent* Chriſtian. And can we think any *Chriſtian* durſt have made ſuch a daring challenge to thoſe that were in Power, and had at that time the ſupreme temporal Authority, if he had not been aſſured of the Truth of what he ſaid. And a little after he adds concerning thoſe evil Spirits; *They fearing Chriſt in God, and God in Chriſt, are ſubject to the Servants of God and of Chriſt.*

So

So that by our Touch or our Breath being ſeized with the Foreſight and Repreſentation of that Fire to which they ſhall be condemned, they alſo at our command go out of the Bodies they have poſſeſſed, though they do it unwillingly, and with grief and ſhame, becauſe it is in your Preſence. What wonder therefore is it if St. *Cyprian*, who lived in the next Age to *Tertullian*, and whilſt this Power continued in the Church, ſhould juſt mention theſe *Exorciſts* who were employed by the Church to caſt out Devils by their Prayers? I am ſure I can ſee nothing corrupt or erroneous in it. For this Power of caſting out Devils was then matter of Fact, and viſible to all. And ſuch a Power being then manifeſtly in the Church, is an Argument of its Purity and Incorruption; otherwiſe we have reaſon to believe, that God would have withdrawn this miraculous Power from it. Nor let any one ſay, that the Truth of this is not well atteſted; for what better Teſtimony can be deſired, than that they did it publickly in the preſence of their Enemies, and offered to do the ſame at any time before the publick Tribunals of their moſt bitter Adverſaries, and that at the Peril of their Lives if they failed in the Undertaking? They appealed to no private Evidence of their own Friends, but did theſe things in publick, and before the moſt diſcerning of their Adverſaries.

The laſt Error with which he charges St. *Cyprian* is, That *there ſhould be Sacrifices for the Dead.* And indeed it does appear from the very firſt Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian*, that he did approve of *Sacrifice* (not *Sacrifices* in the plural number) for the Dead: But then I cannot allow that he was corrupt and erroneous in it. Let us there-

fore see what it was that this holy Father called *Sacrifice for the Dead*; and I will give it you in his own Words: There was one *Victor* a Priest, who at his Death had made *Faustinus*, another Priest, his Executor; which being contrary to a *Canon* before made, St. *Cyprian* and his Collegues order that this Canon should be observed in *Victor*'s case, which, as they tell us, was, *non offeretur pro eo, nec Sacrificium pro Dormitione ejus celebraretur, neque enim apud Altare Dei meretur nominari in Sacerdotum prece, qui ab Altari Sacerdotes & Ministros voluit avocare. No Oblation shall be made for him, nor any Sacrifice celebrated for his Rest: For he deserves not to be named at the Altar of the Lord in the Prayer of the Priests, who would call away the Priests and Ministers from their Attendance at the Altar.* And this Canon St. *Cyprian* says was made *jampridem, a great while before his time.* And the custom of *Sacrificing for the Dead*, as appears from the Canon it self, was much elder than the Canon. For the very forbidding *Sacrifice to be offered for the Rest of him that should make a Priest his Executor*, is a Testimony that it was the custom to *sacrifice for the Dead*, or to *mention the names of the Dead at the Altar* before that time. Now St. *Cyprian* lived within two hundred and fifty years after the Birth of *Christ*, and this Canon having been made *long before his time*, we may very reasonably suppose that it was made fifty years before; and we may also reasonably suppose, that the Custom of *sacrificing for the Dead* was at least fifty years elder: Which carries it up to the time of those Bishops who immediately succeeded to the Apostles. And as I have already shewed, there is no reason to believe that the Apostles

Apoſtles immediate Succeſſors, who had been ordained by them, would in ſuch a matter as this deviate from the Apoſtolical Practice, which they could be no Strangers to; conſequently that it muſt be a Practice derived to them from the Apoſtles themſelves. And if it was ſo, I am ſure it could not be corrupt and erroneous; being well aſſured that the Apoſtles who were in a more eſpecial manner guided by the divine Spirit, would not introduce corrupt and erroneous Practices into the Church. But beſide this we have the Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, who was born within an hundred and fifty years after our Saviour; that is, within fifty years of the Death of St. *John*, and he (in his Book *de Coronâ Militis*) where he ſpeaks of the Traditions and Cuſtoms which the Church had received from the Apoſtles, particularly mentions *Oblationes pro Defunctis*, *Oblations for the Dead*. And he living ſo near the Apoſtles Age, could not be deceived in a matter of Fact as this was; nor would he pretend to impoſe ſuch a thing upon the World, at a time when every Body muſt have been able to refute him. There was no Man of any Senſe or Learning, which lived at that time, but muſt know whether making *Oblations for the Dead* was practiſed by the Apoſtles, as well as we can know at this time, whether the Communion was received kneeling by the Members of the Church of *England* in the ſecond or third year after the Reſtoration of King *Charles* the Second. For the *Oblations for the Dead* were as publick as the Communion it ſelf, and therefore every body that received the Communion, muſt know what was the Apoſtle's practice in this caſe. And *Tertullian* could in his days, no more impoſe a falſe

Tradition upon the World concerning an Apoſtolical Practice, than any one at this time could impoſe a falſe Tradition concerning the publick and notorious Practice of the Church of *England* in the firſt times of King *Charles* the Second.

It is therefore to be known, as has been abundantly proved from the holy Scriptures in a Book publiſhed but a few years ſince, called, *Some Primitive Doctrines revived*, &c. that the Primitive Church, even the Apoſtles themſelves, did believe and hold it for a Chriſtian Doctrine, that the Souls of the Faithful do not at their departure out of this Life immediately aſcend into Heaven, but are detained in a *middle State* called in Scripture *Paradiſe* and *Abraham's Boſom*, where they enjoy great degrees of Happineſs, but vaſtly ſhort of thoſe which they hope to enjoy at the Reſurrection: And they do alſo in this State gradually receive greater degrees of Refreſhment and Joy. They alſo believed that we and the Faithful departed are but one Church; and that though the means of Communication are cut off between us by their Deaths, yet our Communion with each other is not cut off, for they and we make but one Communion of Saints. And therefore as they made no doubt but the Saints departed prayed for the Church on Earth, ſo the *primitive Church* alſo prayed for the Saints departed, as knowing them to be in a ſtate of Expectance, and capable of greater Bleſſings than they yet enjoy. But they did not therefore pray to them as the Church of *Rome* does, no not ſo much as to deſire their Prayers: Becauſe, as I have obſerved, the Communication betwixt them was cut off, though the Communion was not. For Communion and Communication are different things: Thus for inſtance,

inſtance, if all Communication was cut off betwixt the Church of *England* here and the Church of *England* in *America*, which may eaſily be ſuppoſed; no one would blame the Church of *England* for offering up Prayers for the Church in *America*; or the Church in *America*, for doing the like for the Church of *England*. Neither would any one be blame-worthy, that ſhould pray for any particular Perſon in the Church of *America*. The doing this would be no more than we ought to do then, than it is to do it now that the Communication between us is not entirely cut off. But if any particular Man, or any Congregation ſhould kneel on their Knees here, and pray to the faithful in *America* to deſire their Prayers for them; this would be ridiculous and ſuperſtitious. And thus it is with regard to the Saints departed. All Communication betwixt us is entirely cut off, but the Communion is not; therefore we may pray for them as we doubt not but they do for us. But to pray to them is ridiculous and ſuperſtitious, and muſt naturally lead us into a Notion that they are omniſcient and omnipreſent, which are the peculiar Attributes of God, and cannot be communicated to any Creature; and this renders ſuch Prayers moſt wicked and abominable. We ſee therefore that to pray for the Faithful departed, and to pray to them, though but barely to deſire their Prayers for us, are very different things. St. *Paul* (2 *Tim.* i. 18.) prayed for *Oneſiphorus* after *Oneſiphorus* was dead, ſaying, *The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that Day*, or the Day of Judgment; but we never find that he or any of the *primitive Chriſtians* ever prayed to any one that was dead: Becauſe the caſes, as I have ſhewed,

ed, were widely different: And the ancient Prayers for the Dead were such as this which St. *Paul* made for *Onesiphorus*, as *Tertullian* teaches us, (in his Book *de Monogamia)* where he tells the Wife how she should behave herself with regard to her deceased Husband. *Pro anima ejus oret, & refrigerium interim adpostulet ei, & in primâ resurrectione consortium. Let her pray for his Soul, and beseech God to grant him a Partnership in the first Resurrection, and that in the mean time he would vouchsafe him Refreshment.*

To this effect were all the Prayers which the Ancients made for the Dead: They knew nothing of a Purgatory in those Days, nor for some Ages after, and yet they prayed for the Dead; but it was only for those which died in the Lord, who lived and died in the Communion of the Church, and were not known to be guilty of any Sins which might render them fit to be excluded out of it: As we may learn from this very Passage of *Cyprian* before cited; by which it appears, that he and his Collegues forbid that Man to be prayed for, who at his Death shewed a contempt of the Canons of the Church. But it may be asked of what Avail, of what Benefit can our Prayers for the Dead be? Can they receive any Good by them? Shall they not be rewarded according to their own Works, and not according to our Desires and Wishes expressed in our Prayers? It may be answered, that every Man, whether dead or living, shall be rewarded according to his own Works, and not according to the Prayers of others for him; unless his own Prayers and Endeavours accompany the Prayers of the Church: And therefore this Objection is as strong against Prayers for the Living as for the Dead:

Dead: Yet no body queſtions but Prayers for the Living are very proper, as Means to induce God to give them the Grace of Faith and Repentance; or if he has already given them thoſe Graces, to continue them to them. And forasmuch as *Chriſt* has promiſed to hear the Prayers which we make for others, as well as for our ſelves, provided thoſe we pray for do not obſtruct that Benefit by their Obſtinacy and Impenitence; and that the Peace which the Church prays for ſhall reſt on thoſe with whom the Son of Peace dwells: We have no Reaſon to doubt, but ſuch Perſons have Benefit by the Prayers of the Church. Now thoſe who die in the Lord, carrying their Faith and Repentance with them, and their good Works following of them; we have reaſon to believe, do not by any Act of their own, whilſt in their middle State, or State of Expectance, (the State of all Men till the Reſurrection) obſtruct the Benefit of the Churches Prayers, but farther and help it by their own: We have therefore good reaſon to hope, that God may and does hear our Prayers for them; and being of one Communion, though the Communication between us is cut off, our Prayers, in conjunction with their own, are available to their obtaining greater degrees of Refreſhment and Happineſs in the ſtate they are in. And for this Reaſon, we doubt not, it was that St. *Paul* himſelf prayed for *Oneſiphorus* after his Death; and that the primitive Church prayed alſo for all thoſe that died in the Lord. But they prayed not for thoſe who died not in the Lord, as knowing that their Prayers could not avail thoſe who obſtructed the Benefit of them by their own Infidelity or Impenitence. And the Truth

is,

is, not to pray for the Dead which die in the Lord, looks as if we thought all Communion with them, as well as Communication, was cut off. The laying aside this Practice has also introduced a great Error amongst us: Most People believing that the Soul, as soon as separated from the Body, goes immediately either to *Heaven* or *Hell*; understanding by *Heaven* a place of perfect Bliss, and by *Hell* a place of the most exquisite Torments. A Doctrine which has a natural Tendency to overthrow the Resurrection. For if the Soul is perfectly happy, or compleatly miserable, as soon as it goes out of this World and is separated from the Body, what occasion is there for the Body to be united to it any more? How shall it add either to its Happiness or Misery? Or if every Man receives his fatal Sentence the moment after his Death, what occasion can there be for a general Judgment at the last Day? Besides, this Doctrine of every Man's Soul going immediately after his Death to the highest Heaven or the lowest Hell, is directly contrary to the Article of our Creed concerning *Christ*'s Descent into *Hell* or *Hades*; for that place where the Soul of *Christ* continued during the time his Body was in the Grave; and consequently where the Souls of those who die in *Christ*, must rest so long as their Bodies are in the Dust, the Scripture teaches (*Luke* xxiii. 43.) is *Paradise*, a *middle State*, not the *highest Heaven*; for thither our Saviour himself says (*Joh.* xx. 17.) he did not ascend till after his Resurrection. But for the farther proof of this Point, I refer to what I have said in my *Vindication from the Charge of Popery*, (pag. 44.) and to that excellent Book called, *Some Primitive Doctrines revived.* Now

all these things considered, I conceive we may rather say it is corrupt and erroneous not to pray for the Dead; at least it has a plain Tendency to Corruption and Error.

But St. *Cyprian* did not only *pray for the Dead*, but he *offered Sacrifice* for them also; and what has the *Christian* Church to do with *Sacrifices?* I answer, that as I have already observed, St. *Cyprian* does not say *Sacrifices* in the Plural Number, as *De Laune* represents him to have done, but *Sacrifice* in the Singular Number. And it is very evident, and has been abundantly proved by many worthy and learned Divines of the Church of *England*, that *Christ* did institute one Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to be offered to the Father, as the Representative or Memorial of his own *Body* and *Blood*, which was broken and poured forth on the Cross.

This I am well assured, the *primitive Christians*, from the Apostles Days downward, always esteemed it to be a real, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice. Not indeed propitiatory in its own Nature, but by virtue of the original truly propitiatory and meritorious Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross; and not only received it as such, but at every Communion solemnly offered it to God as the Memorial of that Sacrifice. And forasmuch as the Sacrifice of *Christ* was virtually *a propitiation for the sins of the whole World*, and actually and effectually such for all true Believers in *Jesus Christ*; therefore when they offered this Memorial of that great and most proper Sacrifice, they offered it not only for themselves, but as living Members of the mystical Body of *Christ* for the whole Church also. And therefore as soon as they had consecrated or dedicated

ted this Bread and Wine, according to our Saviour's Inſtitution, to be the repreſentative Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, they made a ſolemn Oblation of it to God; and having prayed that he would ſend his Holy Spirit on thoſe Gifts, and make them to become to every one of them the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; they then added thereto a Prayer for the *whole ſtate of Chriſt's Church*, not much unlike that which we call the Prayer for *the Church Militant here on Earth*, in our Liturgy. Which Addition of *Militant here on Earth*, was utterly unknown to the ancient Liturgies, and to our own alſo, till *Bucer* (the grand Corrupter of our Reformation) procured to have it added to the Title of this Prayer, to introduce his Opinion of our holding no Communion with the Saints departed. And therefore the chief difference between the ancient Prayer for the *ſtate of Chriſt's Church*, and that which we uſe now, is, that they prayed for them, and we give thanks for them, praying that we may follow their Examples. Their Prayer was a full Teſtimony that they looked upon the departed Saints to be yet in full Communion with thoſe who were then living in this World: But ours ſeems to have no regard to any Communion with the departed Saints, for whom we do not pray, but only for our ſelves that we may be like them. Indeed in the concluſion, where we pray that *we with them may be partakers of God's Heavenly Kingdom*, we may be ſaid to pray for them, that they may be at the laſt Day admitted to the higheſt Heavens; but the words will bear another Conſtruction, and may ſignify, that we ſuppoſing them already in that place, only pray that we may be admitted to be there with them.

Now

Now the *primitive Christians*, as I think I have sufficiently proved, did not only pray for the Dead, but had very good reasons to do so. And if they might pray for them, then might they *offer Sacrifice* for them also; that is, pray for them at the holy Altar, when they there offered the Bread and Wine as the representative Body and Blood of *Christ*: For there could be no more proper time to pray for them, and thereby testifying their Communion with them, than when they were met together in the most solemn manner to ratify, confirm, and seal their Union with *Christ*, and with all the Members of his Body, whether in this World or the other. And the praying for any particular dead Person by Name on this occasion, was what St. *Cyprian* calls *a Sacrifice for his Rest or Dormition*, as appears from the very words of the Decree before cited which he refers us to, where it is said, *He deserves not to be named at the Altar of the Lord in the Prayer of the Priest, who would call away the Priests and Ministers from their Attendance at the Altar.* Thus we see that the naming him particularly in the Prayer for the *State of Christ's Church*, among those that were departed in *the Faith and Fear*, was called *a Sacrifice for his Rest or Dormition.* And this was what was done at the Burial of every good *Christian*; and his near Friends and Relations likewise met annually on the Day of his Death, to receive the Communion, and to pray for him, as we learn from *Tertullian* (in his forecited Book *de Monogamiâ)* where he says, concerning the Wife of the deceased, *Offerat annuis diebus Dormitionis ejus. Let her offer or communicate yearly on the Days of his departure.* And that this was the practice

of

of the Church he alſo tells us, (in his Book *de Coronâ Militis)* ſaying, *Oblationes pro defunctis annuâ die facimus: We have Oblations for the Dead yearly on the proper Day.* And this Cuſtom of having a Communion at Funerals, with Prayers for the deceaſed Perſon, was preſerved in this Church at our firſt Reformation, there being a Rubrick in the firſt Liturgy of King *Edward* VI. *for the celebration of the Holy Communion, when there is a Burial of the Dead.* Nay in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, as Mr. *Strype* informs us in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation, (pag.* 216.) in the year 1560. *There was an Office appointed to be uſed at the Funerals and Exequies of Chriſtians deceaſed, when the Friends and Neighbours were minded to communicate: Which,* as he obſerves, *was a Cuſtom then, but now wholly diſuſed.* Now this Communion which was celebrated at the Funeral of the Deceaſed, being accompanied with Prayers for his Reſt, Refreſhment and encreaſe of Joy in the State to which he was gone, was then called *Sacrificium pro Dormitione ejus: The Sacrifice for his departure to Reſt and Peace.* And being accompanied with Alms and Oblations offered at the Altar out of the Goods of the Deceaſed, was alſo called *Oblations for the Dead.* This was the Practice of the ancient Church with relation to all Perſons dying in its full Communion. But then beſides this, the Biſhops and Presbyters of every Church, whether dead or living, were particularly named at every ſolemn Communion, together with the Names of the Biſhops of the chief Sees with whom they held Communion; their Names being read publickly out of certain Tables which were called *Dypticks*, and to ſtrike a dead Biſhop's Name out of the *Dypticks*,

Diptycks, was the ſame with denying him to have died in the Communion of the Church: As we learn from the famous Caſe of St. *Chryſoſtom*, mentioned by all our Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians of that Age, and from divers other Monuments of Antiquity. And now I muſt leave every impartial Perſon to judge, whether this is to be called a corrupt and erroneous Practice. It is agreeable to the Scripture, in which we find St. *Paul* himſelf praying for a dead Perſon: It was the univerſal Practice of the *primitive Church*, and we have the Teſtimony of an Author born within fifty Years of the Apoſtles Days, that it was a Tradition derived from them: And it is alſo agreeable to Reaſon, and to that Communion which we ought to maintain with the Saints departed. It is alſo what was practiſed by our firſt Reformers, till they permitted *Calvin* and *Bucer*, and ſome other *foreign Presbyterians*, to prevail with them (without *any worthy Cauſe*, as themſelves confeſſed) to alter their firſt Liturgy. For all which Reaſons I cannot but think, that we have been corrupt and erroneous in laying aſide this Practice, rather than that the Ancients were ſo in retaining it.

The Charge which *De Launе* brings againſt St. *Auſtin*, St. *Ambroſe*, and St. *Chryſoſtom*, is, that they alſo prayed for the Dead; but I have ſaid enough upon that Subject. But then he charges St. *Gregory* with praying for the Soul of *Trajan*, which I confeſs would have proved him to have been corrupt and erroneous in that particular, if the Story were true: For the Church never prayed for departed *Heathens*, but only for thoſe which died in the Lord, or in the full Communion of the Church. But that Story is

rejected by all the Learned as a monkish Legend, and was invented many Ages after St. *Gregory*'s Death. Besides, St. *Gregory* lived after the fourth Century, the Period fixed by *De Laune* himself for the Pattern which we pretend to follow.

But then he charges St. *Austin*, and *Constantine the Great*, as Friends to Relicks. But what was this Friendship? Did they bow down to and worship them as the *Lutherans* and *Papists* do? The Fellow had not impudence enough to charge them with any such thing. All the Friendship then which it appears that they had for them was, that if they met with a Bone, for instance, or any other Relick of a Saint, they would not use it like the Bone of a Dog, and throw it away into the Dirt, but would lay it up among their Rarities, and shew it to a Friend as a Curiosity; or if a new Church was to be built, they would bury it there, that those who should be afterwards buried in that place, might have their Ashes mingled with the Ashes of the Saint; or perhaps might order them to be buried in the same Grave with themselves; saying as the Prophet did, (1 *Kings* xiii. 31.) *When I am dead, lay my Bones beside his Bones.* But for my part, I can see no Error or Corruption in all this?

But St. *Austin*, says *De Laune*, talks of *great Miracles wrought by Relicks.* And does not the Scripture do so too? Was not a Man restored to Life (2 *Kings* xiii. 21.) as soon as his Bones touched the Bones of *Elisha?* And cannot God work a Miracle by the Relick of any other Holy Man, as well as of *Elisha?* It is certain Miracles were not entirely ceased, though they were rare in St. *Austin*'s Age. And therefore why is it incredible

credible that God ſhould in thoſe Days honour ſome Saint in the ſame manner as he had honoured *Eliſha?* I am ſure there is nothing corrupt or erroneous in believing, that God may work a Miracle in what Manner and by what Means he pleaſes. Indeed to ſay that a Relick ſhall or will work a Miracle, is corrupt and erroneous, becauſe we have no promiſe from God concerning any ſuch matter. But to ſay that a Relick has worked a Miracle, or that God has by the means of a Relick wrought a Miracle, is quite a different thing. For this is only aſſerting, that ſuch a matter of Fact has happened; which whether it has or not, muſt depend upon the credibility of thoſe who relate it. If therefore St. *Auſtin* ſhould have affirmed, that ſome Miracles had been wrought by Relicks, and yet thoſe Miracles had never been wrought; this could only have proved him to have been credulous, and to have been impoſed upon in a matter of Fact: But it would by no means have proved him to have been corrupt and erroneous. And yet for any thing *De Laune* could know to the contrary, the Miracles St. *Auſtin* affirms to have been wrought, might be true in Fact.

But he has an heavier Charge againſt St. *Jerom:* He was not only *a great Defender of Relicks*, but alſo *of the Adoration of them.* And for this he quotes St. *Jerom*'s ſecond Epiſtle againſt *Vigilantius*: Where indeed it does appear, that this *Heretick* did not only accuſe St. *Jerom*, but the whole Church likewiſe of this Abomination; and St. *Jerom* poſitively denies the Charge, ſaying, *Non dico nos Martyrum reliquias, ſed ne ſolem quidem & lunam, non Angelos, non Archangelos, non Cherubin, non Seraphin, & omne nomen quod nominatur*

minatur in præsenti sæculo & in futuro, colimus & adoramus, ne serviamus creaturæ potiùs quam Creatori, qui est benedictus in sæcula. I do not only say that we do not worship and adore the Relicks of Martyrs, but neither the Sun nor the Moon, neither Angels nor Archangels, neither Cherubin nor Seraphin, or any Name that is named either in this World or that which is to come, least we should serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. This is the Evidence *De Laune* refers us to, in order to prove St. *Jerom* adored Relicks. And can there be a better Proof that he did not do it? What credit then is to be given to such a Fellow's Assertions?

But then he tells us that Mr. *Mede* says, *That the primitive Christians canonized Saints, and honoured the Relicks in imitation of the* Gentiles, *their* Dæmon-Worship, *thereby to allure them; which,* says he, *laid the Foundation of* Antichrist's δεισιδαιμονία, *and* Idololatrick *Apostasy.* Now I have not Mr. *Mede* by me to consult on this occasion; to examine whether *De Laune* has fairly represented him or not. But this I am sure of, that if Mr. *Mede* speaks of the first four Centuries, which are the times *De Laune* himself (as you have observed) pretends to treat of in this place, he is certainly in the wrong; but if he speaks of later Ages, as I doubt not but he does, he seems to be right. For as Dr. *Inet* has well observed in his Judicious *History of the* English *Church,* (pag. 25.) "Whereas in the first Con-
"versions of the Nations, by the Apostles, and
"their immediate Followers, the greatest care
"was used, not only to bring the Converts to a
"just Idea of the Gospel-Revelation, and con-
"duct their Devotions by the general Rules
"thereof

" thereof; but as far as it was poſſible, to leave " no Footſteps of the Pagan worſhip; and upon " this Ground, the Uſe of Images, and the Rites " of the ancient *Gentile* worſhip were entirely " baniſhed, and a plainneſs and ſimplicity ſuited " to the worſhip of God in Spirit and Truth ge- " nerally introduced. About the ſixth Century, " when the *Northern* Nations were converted, " they had been allowed to introduce their " Images into Churches; and abundance of new " Rites, and Pomp, and Ceremonies were then " brought in". And from about this time Corruptions did begin to come into the Church by degrees; and from this time I make no queſtion, but Mr. *Mede* dates the Introduction of them. Though if he does not, his bare aſſertion, without good proof from ancient Teſtimonies, is of no weight: For he lived 1200 Years after the Times we are concerned about; and Evidence ought to be fetched from contemporary Writers, or from ſuch as lived very near the Times of which they give an Account.

Then *De Laune* tells us of more Corruptions of thoſe Times, and ſays, they had *Sufflation*, *Trine Immerſion*, *Exorciſm*, *Chriſm*, *white Garments*, *Milk*, *Honey to the New-baptized*, *giving the Euchariſt to the Infant*, *from the fourth to the twelfth Century*, *mingling Water with the Sacramental Wine*, *the Eulogiæ*, &c. I ſhall therefore very briefly conſider theſe Particulars, which he calls Corruptions. Firſt as to *Sufflation*, that was only a *Species* of *Exorciſm*, of which I have already treated, and ſhewn, that it was no Corruption, and ſo have I done with regard to *Chriſm*. As to *Trine Immerſion*, I can ſee no Corruption in it, yet it does not appear to have been an uni-

verſal Practice; for every particular Church acted in this matter as they ſaw convenient: Some dipped the Perſon they baptized thrice at the naming the Name of every diſtinct Perſon of the Trinity; and others dipped but once, as they thought that a properer Symbol of the divine Unity. And this they did without breaking Communion, or condemning one another about ſuch an indifferent matter. As to *white Garments*, I muſt declare I can ſee no Error or Corruption in the uſing of them: And ſure the Church may, without being charged with Iniquity for it, enjoyn that Perſons coming to be baptized ſhould come in a white Garment? And if they alſo ordered that Milk and Honey ſhould be given to the Newbaptized, I can ſee no harm in it; it was an indifferent matter whether they gave them that or any thing elſe. As to the *Euchariſt being given to Infants*, he himſelf owns it not to be done till after the 4th Century, and therefore falls not within the compaſs of time I am concerned to defend, and conſequently I have no occaſion to take notice of it farther.

As to *mingling Water with the ſacramental Wine*, that was ſo far from being a Corruption, that it is rather a Corruption not to do it. For the Cup which our Saviour gave his Diſciples, contained the Repreſentative of that Blood of the New Teſtament, which he then was about to ſhed on the Croſs: But what he there ſhed was not Blood alone or unmixed, but Blood and Water, as the Scripture teaches. And there is no doubt but the Wine which was in the very Cup that our Saviour himſelf bleſſed or conſecrated, was alſo mixed with Water, as thoſe that are well skilled in the *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms have abundantly

dantly proved, and particularly Dr. *Lightfoot*, (Hor. Hebraic. in *Mat. cap.* xxvi.) a Perſon as well skilled in thoſe Antiquities, as perhaps any Man this Nation has bred. And the primitive Church even from the Apoſtles times, as we learn from *Juſtin Martyr*, who was born before St. *John*'s Death, always ſo adminiſtred it. And ſurely the Apoſtles and their immediate Succeſſors would not corrupt ſo weighty an Inſtitution of *Chriſt*: They could not but know what was in the Cup which *Chriſt* gave them to drink; nor would they teach their immediate Succeſſors, with whom *Juſtin* was Contemporary, to adminiſter another Liquor than our Lord himſelf had done. Nor can we ſuppoſe that they would all of them at once immediately deviate from the practice of the Apoſtles. Yet they muſt have done ſo, if the Apoſtles did not mix Water with the Wine in the holy Euchariſt. Nor can we find any Age or any Church where Water was not mixed with the euchariſtical Wine, 'till *John Calvin* introduced the contrary practice. Our firſt Reformers were ſenſible of this, and in the firſt Liturgy of *Edw.* VI. ordered, that *when the Wine was put into the Chalice, a little pure and clean Water ſhould be put into it alſo.* But to pleaſe *Calvin* and *Bucer*, the latter part of this Rubrick was omitted in the ſecond Liturgy. Which I muſt needs ſay I look upon to be a corruption, and a plain deviation from the practice of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles.

The laſt charge of Corruption in the primitive Church is the *Eulogiæ*, by which I ſuppoſe he means pieces of conſecrated Bread ſent from one Dioceſe to another. But I find no mention of this till the middle of the fourth Century, and

then it seems some Persons began this Practice; but the Church immediately condemned it in the fourteenth Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*. But if the Church must be charged with Corruptions which she herself condemned in her Synods, then no Church, not even that which was under the Government of the Apostles themselves can be said to be free from Corruptions; for they were forced, as we learn from the Scriptures, (*Acts* xv.) to condemn Corruptions and Errors in a Synod, which some *Judaizing Christians* would have imposed upon the Church. But sure those Errors concerning the necessity of Circumcision, and the observation of the Law of *Moses*, are not to be charged upon the apostolical Church, which so solemnly condemned them? No more ought these *Eulogiæ* to be charged upon the primitive Church, which took so much care to prohibit them as soon as they began.

At the end of his Charge he claps an *&c.* as if he had a great many more Corruptions to charge upon the primitive Church; but what they are I cannot so much as guess, yet doubt not but whenever they shall be produced by any of *De Laune*'s Friends, they may easily receive an Answer.

Having thus vindicated the primitive Church and Fathers from the groundless Aspersions cast upon them by this ignorant or impudent Fellow, and shewn, that what he charges upon them for Corruptions and Errors are either false and groundless, or else that the Error and Corruption is on the other side, and more justly chargeable on those that have deviated from the primitive Practice. I shall now proceed to vindicate our own Church from the Calumnies he has thrown upon her.

First

First then he tells us, *(pag.* 21.) that *it is manifeſt that our firſt Reformers did not make ſuch a perfect piece from pure primitive Antiquity in the firſt Reformation, and forming of our Liturgy, which contains ſo much the Rites, Services and Ceremonies of the Church; for if ſo, there had been no ſuch need to make ſo many Alterations, and reform ſo often, and in ſo many things the Reformation.* But let us enquire for whoſe ſake, and upon whoſe account theſe Alterations were made: The Church thought her Liturgy very good, and agreeable to the primitive Standard at her firſt Reformation, and conceived that ſhe could not have compiled it ſo well as ſhe had then done, without the particular *Aid of the Holy Ghoſt*; as the Act of Parliament which eſtabliſhes that Liturgy tells us. Neither did ſhe want it alter'd, but was well ſatisfied with it, as we learn from the very Act of Parliament that eſtabliſhed the ſecond Liturgy inſtead of it. However, it was altered, as I have before obſerved, to ſatisfy *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *Martyr*, *Fagius*, and their Followers the *Presbyterians* here. Then again in the firſt years of King *James* the Firſt, ſome more Alterations were made to gratify the *Puritans*, who deſired thoſe Alterations at the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, and promiſed Conformity upon the obtaining them; but did not keep their words. Several Alterations were made a third time at the Reſtoration of King *Charles* the Second, to gratify the *Nonconformiſts*, and to take off divers of their Cavils which they made at the Conference in the *Savoy*. Since which time no Alterations have been made. But inſtead of thanks for complying with the Diſſenters ſo far, this unanſwerable Champion of theirs (and we have reaſon to think he ſpeaks the

ſenſe

ſenſe of the whole Party, who are ſo very fond of his Book) tells us, that *if our firſt Reformation had been primitive, we would not have alter'd it.* Thus we ſee what we have got by ſtriving to oblige them, and deviating from our firſt Liturgy, and receding ſo far, and in ſo many Points, from the practice of the pure primitive Church, in hopes to gain them over; only to be ridiculed by thoſe very Perſons for whoſe ſake all this was done. But it is to be hoped, that the Governors of the Church may by this time ſee their Error, in hoping to win the Diſſenters by ſuch kind of Compliances. And that if they ſhall hereafter have any thoughts of correcting the Liturgy, it will be to make it more Primitive indeed, and that inſtead of ſeeking to gain the Diſſenters by deviating farther from the primitive Practice, as we have formerly done; let us ſeek to do it by going ſtill nearer to the primitive Practice of the firſt three or four Centuries, and make our Church as near as poſſible, ſuch as the Catholick Church was at the time of the Council of *Nice.* We have tried all other Methods to gain the Diſſenters, and they have failed us: Why then ſhould we not try this at the laſt? God be praiſed our Church, as it is, has as few deviations from the primitive Church as (I am firmly perſuaded) any Church this Day in the World: And thoſe Deviations have been made to gain the Diſſenters, as I have ſhewed; but inſtead of gaining them, it has only given them a better ground to reproach us: But would we return fully and perfectly to the Plan of the true primitive Church, this Ground of Reproach at leaſt would be taken away, and we ſhould be more likely to gain even the Diſſenters themſelves. For let Men decry

Antiquity,

Antiquity, *Univerſality*, *and Conſent*, as much as they pleaſe, yet all Men that will ſeriouſly and impartially conſider, muſt ſee and be convinced that the Truth is moſt ancient, and all Corruptions and Errors muſt be Novel. Nay we might not only have better hopes of gaining the *Proteſtant Diſſenters* to embrace our Communion, but the *Papiſts* alſo: For that learned Primate Archbiſhop *Bramhall*, in his *Vindication of himſelf and the Epiſcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian charge of Popery* (pag. 140.) aſſures us, *that Father* Paul Harvis, *(a Romaniſt violent enough) hath often ſaid to him, that if we had retained the Liturgy uſed in* Edward *the ſixth's time, he would not have forborn to come to our Communion.* And indeed if we would entirely go into the old Paths preſcrib'd to us by *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, and deliver'd to us by them and their apoſtolical Succeſſors, we might reaſonably expect more Strength and Grace than we now find amongſt us, and greater Aſſiſtances from the holy Spirit. Would we entirely conform our ſelves to the Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip of the primitive Church, and endeavour alſo to be truly Primitive in our Lives, we might then hope for as great a meaſure of God's Spirit, as we find to have been in the primitive Chriſtians; and for ſuch an undaunted Courage, as might keep us from all ſinful Compliances and Prevarications in the time of Danger. We have God's gracious Promiſe of his more particular Grace and Favour, whilſt we keep to the old Ways; for *(Jer.* vi. 16.) *Thus ſaith the Lord, ſtand ye in the Ways, and ſee, and ask for the old Paths, where is the good Way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find reſt for your Souls.*

But

But to return to *De Laune*, his next Calumny which he throws upon our Church is, that *many of her Rites and Ceremonies are Novel.* And he begins with thoſe *three Ceremonies about which there was ſo much contention at the* Savoy, as he ſays, *viz. Kneeling, Surplice, and the Croſs in Baptiſm.* As to *kneeling at the Altar, or at the Sacrament of the Supper*, he tells us, *that it is novel, and but of yeſterday, and never known before Tranſubſtantiation. That Pope* Honorius *in the year* 1214. *ordained kneeling at the Sacrament. And his Predeceſſor* Innocent III. *Tranſubſtantiation:* And for this he cites the *Decretal*, (lib. 3. tit. 1. cap. 10.) And adds that it is ſaid, *That in* Tertullian *and* Chryſoſtom's *time, they were ſaid to ſtand at the Altar when they partook of the Supper. And* Socrates *ſaith, They took it in a Table-Geſture, eating it at their Love-Feaſts.* And for this he quotes *Hoſpinian (de Orig. Templ. l.* 2. *c.* 2.) and *Socrates, (l.* 5.) and *Paræus.* But as to *Hoſpinian*, I am ſure he ſays nothing of the matter in the place *De Laune* refers to: And whether he ſays it in any other place or not, I think it not worth my while to examine; for *Hoſpinian* is but a modern Author, and by no means to be depended on in his Repreſentation of the Cuſtoms of the ancient Church, neither is *Paræus*; and for *Socrates*, I am well aſſured he aſſerts no ſuch thing as *De Laune* here pretends. Neither is there one word concerning the Sacrament in that Chapter of the *Decretal* to which he refers us. So that it is impoſſible that a Man ſhould ſhew more Ignorance or Impudence, or both, than this Fellow has done in this one Paſſage. But he knew that thoſe, for whoſe ſake he wrote his Book, would believe all he ſaid without

without Examination. However I do allow that in the primitive Church the Eucharist was received standing, because standing was also the Posture used by them at their Prayers, on all *Sundays*, and on all other Days also from *Easter* to *Whitsontide*, as we learn from the 20th Canon of the Council of *Nice*, and many passages of the Fathers who lived before or about that time. And this they did, as they tell us, *out of a joyful memory of the Resurrection.* However it appears from hence, that they received it in a *praying Posture*, and not in a *Table-Gesture*, as *De Laune* would have us believe. They prayed standing, and therefore they received the Eucharist standing; we pray kneeling, and therefore we receive the Eucharist so. Whereby it appears that kneeling at the receiving the holy Communion, is no more a deviation from the practice of the primitive Church, than kneeling at our Prayers is, and yet I never heard that found fault with by any. Besides, in the primitive Church they kneel'd at their Prayers, and consequently at the receiving the holy Eucharist on all Days but *Sundays*, and the time between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*; so that though they did not kneel always on that occasion, they kneeled sometimes, and thereby shewed they did not think that posture unlawful.

As to the *Surplice*, he says, *the Fathers used it not, though it is clear the* Pagans *did*; *and it was brought into the Church by Pope* Adrian, *Anno* 796. But he gives us no Authority for this, but two or three Moderns, *Salmasius* and *Petavius*, and one who wrote a Reply to Dr. *Morton*, and has no Name: Neither does he so much as tell us what Authority they pretend to have for it. And if his

his Quotations from them are no fairer than thoſe he produces for his former Aſſertion, it is only a farther Teſtimony of the Fellow's impudence. But I ſhall not examine whether they are or not, for he here refers us not to Books and Chapters as before, but to voluminous Authors at large; and it is not worth my while to turn over ſo many Volumes to ſee whether a Fellow whom I have ſo often catched at falſe Quotations, be not guilty of the ſame here alſo. But nevertheleſs, whatever theſe Moderns may ſay upon the matter, we have Witneſſes living in the primitive Times, which do aſſure us that an outward *white Garment* or *Surplice*, was worn by the Prieſts of the *Chriſtian Church* when they celebrated divine Ordinances. For St. *Chryſoſtom* and St. *Jerom*, who both lived 400 years before the time of Pope *Adrian*, by whom *De Laune* pretends the Surplice was firſt brought into the Church, plainly ſpeak of it as uſed in their Times; that is, within the Times whoſe uſages we pretend and deſire to follow. For whereas *Pelagius*, like our *Diſſenters* at this time, had affirmed, that *the glory of Cloaths and Ornaments was a thing contrary to God and Godlineſs.* St. *Jerom (adverſ. Pelag. lib.* 1. *cap.* 9.) anſwers him and ſays, *Is it enmity with God if I wear my Coat ſomewhat handſome? If a Biſhop, a Prieſt, a Deacon, and the reſt of the Eccleſiaſtical Order, come to adminiſter the uſual Sacrifice in a white Garment, are they hereby God's Adverſaries?* Now if the Clergy had not then miniſtred in a white Garment, St. *Jerom*'s anſwer would have been trifling and ridiculous. But St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Teſtimony is as plain and full as can be deſired, (*Hom.* 83. on St. *Mat.*) where ſpeaking to the Miniſters of the Church, he ſays, having firſt told them

them ſome of the Duties of their Office, *This is your Dignity, your Stay, your Crown, not that you walk up and down in a white and ſhining Garment.* How nonſenſical muſt this Speech have been, how unworthy the Eloquence of *Chryſoſtom*, if the Prieſts at that time had not worn a Surplice or white Garment in their Miniſtrations? But *De Laune* ſays 'tis of *Pagan* original, but he has not proved it, and I think I have ſufficiently ſhewed, that we have no reaſon to take his word for it.

Then he proceeds to the *ſign of the Croſs in Baptiſm*, and ſays, *we read of no ſuch Rite amongſt the Ancients.* And I muſt tell him that neither have we any ſuch Rite: We uſe not the ſign of the Croſs *in Baptiſm*, but only *after Baptiſm.* For the Baptiſm is compleatly finiſhed as ſoon as the Perſon has been dipped, or has had Water poured upon him *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, as we declare in the Rubrick following the Form of *private Baptiſm*, where the ſigning with the Croſs ought not to be uſed, being directed to be uſed afterwards when the Child is brought to have his Baptiſm declared to the Church. For that Rubrick ſays with regard to this Baptiſm, in which the ſign of the Croſs has been omitted, *Let them not doubt but that the Child ſo baptized is lawfully and ſufficiently baptized.* The only difference in this caſe between private and publick Baptiſm is, that when a Child has received private Baptiſm, it is not ſigned with the Croſs till ſome conſiderable time after the Baptiſm; and in publick Baptiſm it is ſigned immediately after it; but in both caſes it is not ſigned till after the Baptiſm is compleated. It muſt indeed be owned, that in the thir-

tieth

tieth Canon it is called, *the ſign of the Croſs in Baptiſm*; but it is evident that no more is meant by that Expreſſion, than *the ſign of the Croſs which is directed to be uſed in the Form or Service appointed for Baptiſm in the Liturgy.* And that very Form ſhews, that that ſign is not to be uſed till the Baptiſm is ſufficiently compleated; conſequently that ſign cannot be ſaid to be uſed by us till *after Baptiſm*, and ſo *De Laune* confeſſes it was uſed in the *primitive Church*, and therefore is no Novelty as he pretends.

The next Novelty with which he charges us is, that we have left out the *Chriſm* in the Office of *Confirmation.* And I do confeſs we have in this Point deviated from the Practice of the *primitive Church*; but we have good reaſon to believe, that this was done to oblige the *foreign Presbyterians* and their Friends here: And the recompence they make us for it, is to make this which was done to gratify them, a new objection againſt our Communion. As to his ſaying that our Confirmation by impoſition of Hands is not warranted by Scripture, I before ſufficiently confuted that, and need not here repeat what has been ſaid. And whereas he tells us Archbiſhop *Cranmer* does acknowledge that there is no direction in Scripture for Confirmation, and refers us to a Paper of his printed by Biſhop *Burnet:* I muſt acknowledge truly, that Archbiſhop *Cranmer* was certainly very wrong in many things contained in that Paper; but then it appears from the ſame Paper, that he himſelf changed his Opinion in many Particulars there mentioned, after he had ſeen the Opinions of others, and heard their Reaſons, and particularly in this very point.

As

As to what he ſpeaks concerning baptizing Infants, you have given ſo particular an Anſwer to that Point in your Book, that I need not make any Additions to it.

The next Novelty with which he charges our Church is its having a *Liturgy:* This he tells us *cannot be found among the Ancients.* But let us hear his Proofs. *Tertullian*, he ſays, in his Apology, *(cap.* 30.) ſhews *it was clear that in the* 3*d Century they had no* Directory *or Book to pray by*, as appears from theſe words, *We look up to Heaven with our Hands ſtretched forth, as being innocent and bare-headed, as not aſhamed to make our Prayers* ſine Monitore, *without a Directory, as coming from the free motion of our own Heart.* But I muſt ſay that *De Laune*, though a Schoolmaſter, did not underſtand the word *Monitor*, or elſe would impoſe upon us a falſe Tranſlation of it; for that word is never uſed to ſignify a Book, but a Perſon, and properly ſignifies a *Prompter*, one that ſtands behind another to tell him what he has next to ſay if he happen to be out: And therefore he has plainly miſrepreſented *Tertullian*, who does not mean that they had no Form of Prayer for their common uſe in publick Worſhip, but only that their Prayers being agreeable to the free Motions of their Hearts, they were ſo perfect in them, that they needed no *Monitor* or *Prompter* to ſtand behind them, and tell them what they were to ſay next. But that there were Forms of Prayer before *Tertullian*'s Time, is evident from *Juſtin Martyr*, who lived ſome years before, even from that very place which is cited by *De Laune*, only he has miſrepreſented it in his Tranſlation, as he had done by *Tertullian*; for whereas *De Laune* ſays *they began with Prayer*, the Orignial

is, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι, *making or offering their Common Prayers.* And then having in this manner misrepresented this holy Father, he has the impudence to say, *here was no Liturgy or Common Prayers mentioned*; whereas *Justin Martyr*'s words are, *Common Prayers.* What can be said in defence of such a Man as is past all shame, who first misrepresents the Fathers in his Translation, and then tells us, that they make no mention of that which they do mention in the most direct Terms, only he had concealed it. Now *Common Prayers* must be a *Liturgy* or set Form, for an *extempore Prayer* can never be common. And *De Laune* himself acknowledges as much, when he makes *Liturgy* and *Common Prayer* synonymous Terms. I might produce many more Arguments for the Antiquity of *Liturgies* or *set Forms of Prayer*, but that having been so fully done by many that have written in defence of our present Book of *Common Prayer*, I refer such as may desire farther satisfaction to those Authors. Then he tells us that *Walafridus Strabo*, who lived in the ninth Century, says, *All which is done now with a multitude of Prayers, Lessons, Songs and Consecrations, which the Apostles, and those who next followed them, did with Prayers and remembrance of the Lord's Sufferings, even as he commanded.* But does *Walafridus Strabo* therefore say, that the Apostles, and those who next followed them, had no *Liturgy* or *Forms of Common Prayer*, which is the Point *De Laune* here pretends to prove. But what is it to the purpose to say, that the Prayers were more numerous in the ninth Century than they were in the apostolical Age; This is therefore mere impertinence, and so is what he quotes from *Socrates* immediately after; though

though he there also misrepresents his Author, for *Sacrates* does not say as he tells us he does, *That among all the Christians in that Age, scarce two were to be found that used the same words in Prayer:* But *Socrates* really says, *in all Places, and amongst all Sects, you will scarcely find two Churches exactly agreeable about their Prayers.* And then he goes on to tell us, what Customs they had in one Church which they had not in another. But who ever pretended that all Churches ought to use the same *Liturgy*, or ever did do so. But still this is no proof, but that every Church had their *Liturgy* or stated Forms of Prayer. Neither by *a Church* does *Socrates* mean a single Congregation, as the Dissenters may be apt to imagine, but a *Patriarchate* or *Province* at least, for such are the Churches *Socrates* here treats of, as appears by the particulars he mentions both before and after, as *Jerusalem*, *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Rome*, &c. in each of which we are well assured there were *stated Liturgies* long before the time of *Socrates*; and we also know that those *Liturgies* were different from one another. But the difference was not in any material Points, but only in some indifferent Matters which the Church has Authority to determine as she pleases.

I should write a Volume should I go about to correct all his Mistakes, and Blunders, and Falshoods which immediately follow, with relation to the particular Offices of the Church, the Responses, Collects, *&c.* Let it suffice to say, that he has given a false account concerning every one of them; and I shall be at any time ready to prove it when duly required to do so. I shall therefore take notice but of two Particulars more in his long List, and that is what he says con-

cerning *Eccleſiaſtical Orders*, and the *Dedication of Churches*.

And firſt he tells us, that *as for* Eccleſiaſtical Orders *and* Officers *of the Lord Archbiſhops, Lord Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons*, &c. *and the Supremacy exerciſed one over another in the Church of* England, *they are ſo far from having the ſtamp of primitive Antiquity, that they are not to be found therein, at leaſt for the three or four firſt Centuries.* Now I do very freely confeſs that Archbiſhops and Biſhops were not called *Lords* in the primitive Times; that is a civil Honour granted to them by the favour of the Prince. Nor do our *Biſhops* pretend to derive their *Lordſhips* from the Apoſtles or primitive Biſhops, but from their Baronies and Peerage, which are the Grants of the Crown, and were beſtowed upon them by the Kings of this Realm, who are the Fountain from whence all civil Honours are derived, and have an undoubted Right to confer them on whom they pleaſe: And they have thought fit to honour the chief of the Clergy with them. But then as to *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, without the Title of *Lords*, together with *Deans* and *Archdeacons*, with a Superiority or Juriſdiction one over another, (not a *Supremacy* as *De Laune* calls it, or ſovereign unlimited Power) ſuch as is exerciſed in the Church of *England*, this is certainly of primitive Antiquity, and has been proved by a multitude of Authors, ſince the Controverſy about Epiſcopacy was on foot. The three Orders of *Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons*, with a Superiority one over the other, are frequently mentioned by St. *Ignatius*, a Contemporary of the Apoſtles, in every one of his Epiſtles, which have been tranſlated into *Engliſh* by Archbiſhop *Wake*, and

and may therefore be eaſily conſulted by every *Engliſh* Reader. And for the Learned they cannot but know, that there is ſcarce a Book now extant, written in the three or four firſt Centuries, as well as in later times, which makes any mention of the Governors of the Church, which does not ſpeak of theſe three as diſtinct Orders, and the one ſuperior to the other; ſo that it muſt be want of Will, and not want of Light, which muſt make any Man of Learning, who has but dipped into the Writings of the Fathers, to diſpute this Point. And this has been alſo now ſo fully proved by thoſe who have written in our own Language from the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, that no body who will give themſelves the trouble to read even our modern Authors, who have written on the Subject, can diſpute it. As to *Archbiſhops*, they were not a diſtinct Order from other *Biſhops* in the primitive Times, neither are they ſo now. Yet in the *primitive* Church, as well as now, as we learn particularly from the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, there was one Biſhop in a Province, who by *ancient Cuſtom*, as it is there called, had ſome Prerogative and Privileges above the reſt: Such as to ſummon them to Councils or Synods, and preſide in thoſe Synods; to take care of vacant Biſhopricks within the Province, to preſide in the Conſecration of other *Biſhops*, and in all matters which concerned the general government of the Province. And ſuch are our preſent *Archbiſhops*. Alſo in the primitive Church every Biſhop had his *College of Presbyters*, reſident with him at his Cathedral Church, with whom he conſulted and adviſed in matters relating to the Government of his Church; and this College of Presbyters is

what every Biſhop has now in the Church of *England*, only we call it the *Dean and Chapter*; and the *Dean* is no other than the Head or firſt Presbyter of this College or Chapter. Then alſo in the primitive Church, the Biſhop had his *Deacons* to attend him in his Miniſtrations; and one of theſe who was called the *Archdeacon*, was frequently ſent by him to viſit his Dioceſe, and to give him an Account of what he found amiſs in any part of it. This *Archdeacon* alſo had Authority from the *Biſhop*, where he found any thing out of order, to give directions to have it rectified; and if his directions were not obeyed, then to inflict Church Cenſures on the diſobedient; but all this he did as under the *Biſhop*, and by his Authority; and whoever thought himſelf grieved by the *Archdeacon*, might apply to the Biſhop for redreſs. And this is the ſame with what our *Archdeacons* do in *England*. I can aſſure you this is agreeable to the government of the primitive Church: But I ſhould much exceed the bounds of a Letter, if I ſhould enter into a particular proof of theſe matters; but I have, I conceive, fully proved them in a Book I publiſhed ſome years ago, called an *Account of Church-government and Governors*, to which I therefore refer. And as to what *De Laune* quotes upon this occaſion from Dr. *Stillingfleet's Irenicum:* I ſhall only ſay of it that it is a Book which was written by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his younger years, when he either underſtood little of theſe matters, or elſe was ſo carried away and biaſſed by the prejudices of an unhappy Education in the time of the Rebellion, that he did not ſee the weakneſs of his own Arguments, and the ſlender foundation they were built upon; and that there is not any thing

in

in that Book which was not anſwered by himſelf in ſome of his other Works written in his riper years. And for the other two Books he afterwards refers us to, they have both received full and ſatisfactory Anſwers, in Dr. *Maurice*'s Treatiſe of *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy*, and his Anſwer to Mr. *Baxter*'s Church Hiſtory.

In the next place *De Laune* tells us, that *the primitive Fathers were againſt dedicating Churches to Saints and Angels.* And I can aſſure the Diſſenters, that the Church of *England* is ſo too. We do indeed call our Churches by the Names of Saints and Angels, but we dedicate them only to God, as may be ſeen in the Forms of Conſecration, which have been uſed by any of our Biſhops ſince the Reformation, particularly that uſed by Biſhop *Andrews* at the Conſecration of a Chapel, and publiſhed in *Sparrow*'s Collection of Canons, which has been the general pattern for thoſe which have been uſed ſince. And the Names of a Saint or an Angel are given to them only for diſtinction ſake, even as we give the like Names to our Children: And it may as well be ſaid, that when a Child is baptized by the Name of *Peter*, *James*, or *John*, or by the Name of *Michael*, *Gabriel*, or *Raphael*, he is dedicated to that Saint or Angel whoſe Name he bears, as that a Church is ſo dedicated, becauſe it bears any of thoſe Names, though the Title of Saint is annexed to the Name given to a Church, and is not annexed to that which is given to a Man. For the adding or the leaving out that Title, can make no difference in the caſe: For the bare Title *Saint*, cannot make a Dedication.

And when *De Laune* has in this manner, very falſely and maliciouſly, charged the Church of

England with the introduction of so many Novelties; he then again repeats what he had said before, concerning our deviating from the *primitive Church*, by the discontinuance of many of their practices; and therefore concludes, that we cannot pretend to make the *primitive Church* our Example. *We may see* (he tells us from a Book called the *Protestant Reconciler*) *how vainly 'tis pretended that these Ceremonies were retained and imposed, to manifest the justice and equity of the Reformation, by letting their enemies see, they did not break Communion with them for mere indifferent things; or that they left the Church of* Rome *no farther, than she left the ancient Church; as saith Dr.* Stillingfleet. *When 'tis manifest*, says he, *that we left off praying for departed Saints, the unction of the Sick, the mixing Water with the sacramental Wine, the Chrism, Exorcism, the anointing the baptized Person, crossing the Breast at the consecration of the Eucharist and the baptismal Water, with many other things which were retained in the ancient Church, and in the Liturgy of Edw.* VI. But as I have already shewed these things were left out, not because our Church condemned them, but purely to gratify the Dissenters; and now we see the end for which they were so importunate to have them left out, not that they intended to unite with us, if we would so far comply with them; but only that we might give them an handle to upbraid us for departing in so many particulars from the practice of the *primitive Church*. From whence we may see, that their perpetual Clamours which they make against the ancient Ceremonies and Customs still retained by us, is not because if those also should be laid aside they would be ready to unite

with us, but only that they might have yet farther occaſion to upbraid us with our departure from the primitive Cuſtoms. Since therefore it is ſo evidently impoſſible to gain them by theſe Compliances and Deviations from the ancient Practices of the Church; and that all our endeavours this way have only tended to raiſe new and greater objections againſt us; why ſhould we not again reſtore theſe primitive Cuſtoms, and thereby, at leaſt, take off this Objection; that by making our Church in all particulars conformable to the primitive of the three or four firſt Centuries, we may deprive all our Adverſaries, of what denomination ſoever, of this Objection, which is certainly of the moſt weight of any they can have againſt us?

As to our *ſymbolizing with Popery*, you have already in the following Book ſufficiently anſwered that Point; as you have alſo done whatever is Argumentative in *De Laune*'s Book. And my buſineſs is only to ſhew his Falſhoods and Prevarications as to Matters of Fact; of which I ſhall give one or two Inſtances more, and then I have done.

De Laune ſays, *(pag.* 50.) That *the Epiſtles, Goſpels, and Pſalms, in the Service-Book, are miſtranſlated, being taken from the corrupt vulgar Latin Bible, which is ſo extream faulty, and ſo much complained of by the learned, both Proteſtants and others.* Now nothing can be more falſe than this, and even an *Engliſh* Reader may diſcover it to be ſo, with relation to the Epiſtles and Goſpels, which are the very ſame word for word with thoſe portions of Scripture in our common Bibles of the laſt Tranſlation, which was made from the Original *Greek*, as the Preface to that Bible, and

and the Title page of the New Teſtament informs us: And is alſo the very ſame that is uſed by the Diſſenters themſelves. And the impudence of *De Laune* in endeavouring to put ſuch a notorious falſhood upon the World, which the moſt common Reader, by only comparing the Common Prayer Book and Bible might diſcover to be falſe, ſhews what a mean opinion he had of the Diſſenters themſelves, and how eaſy he believed they were to be impoſed on: And plainly diſcovers, that he looked upon them to be Men that would take any of their Party's word upon truſt without examination; and that he was able to make them believe juſt what he pleaſed, though never ſo falſe, and that falſhood never ſo eaſy to be diſcovered.

The *Pſalms* indeed are different from the Tranſlation which we have of them in the Bible. But a Scholar, as *De Laune* was, might eaſily have diſcovered that they were not tranſlated from the vulgar *Latin* Bible, becauſe where the vulgar *Latin* differs from the *Hebrew*, they alſo differ from the *Latin*, and agree with the *Hebrew*, and that in at leaſt two hundred and fifty places; whereas they differ from the *Hebrew*, and agree with the vulgar *Latin* in not much above ſixty Paſſages, and have not done that without good Reaſon and Authority. To inſtance in that very paſſage which *De Laune* has picked out, *(pag.* 51.) where he tells us, that *they have added three whole verſes to the fourteenth Pſalm, which are not in any of the original Copies.* And it is confeſſed that they are not in any of the *Hebrew* Copies now extant: But that they were in the old *Hebrew* Copies we have no reaſon to doubt, becauſe they are in the *Septuagint* which was tranſlated from an *Hebrew* Copy

Copy much ancienter than any we have now, which was frequently uſed by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, whoſe Quotations from the Old Teſtament are generally more agreeable to the *Septuagint*, than to our preſent *Hebrew* Bibles in thoſe places where the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint* differ. And theſe three verſes which *De Laune* ſays our Tranſlators of the *Pſalms* in the Common Prayer Book have added to the Scriptures, are all joined to a Quotation of the other parts of the fourteenth *Pſalm*, by St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Romans* (Chap. iii. ver. 13. *&c.*) Having therefore ſuch infallible Authority to convince them that they belonged to that *Pſalm*, they cannot be juſtly charged with making additions to the holy Scriptures in this place, as *De Laune* accuſes them to have done. But for a fuller Vindication of this Tranſlation of the *Pſalms* in our *Liturgy*, I refer you to the Learned and Reverend Mr. *Johnſon*'s excellent Book written on this Occaſion, called *Holy David*, where you will find it admirably defended againſt this and all the other objections which have been made to it by our Diſſenters.

Another impudent falſhood of *De Laune*'s is where he tells us, that *the ſecond Epiſtle to the* Theſſalonians, *and the ſecond and third of* John, *are left out of the* Sunday *and Holiday Leſſons*. Whereas every body that but looks into our Calendar in the Common Prayer Book, and the Table for Leſſons on *Sundays* and Holidays, muſt ſee that we have very few proper Leſſons for *Sundays* and Holidays out of the New Teſtament; but that every Chapter in that Book, excepting the *Revelations*, (which being not to be underſtood by vulgar Readers, if by the Learned themſelves,

is

is not thought so proper for the edification of the Audience) is read every Day of the year in its course; and if that Day happens to be a *Sunday*, the Chapter for that Day is read out of the second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, or the second and third of *John*, as regularly and duly as out of any other part of the holy Scripture. And that there are but four *Sundays* in the whole Year, that is *Palm-Sunday*, *Easter-Day*, *Whitsunday*, and *Trinity Sunday*, when the second Lessons appointed in the ordinary course are changed for others more suitable to the occasion; and it so happens, that no Lesson out of the second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, or the second and third of *John*, can fall out to be read on any of those Days, and so to be set aside for any proper Lessons then appointed. So that he could not have been more unlucky, than in pitching upon these Books as left out of the *Sunday* Lessons; since it is evident that whatever Chapters out of some other Books of the New Testament, may happen to be omitted in the ordinary course of reading, when any of those four *Sundays* fall, yet the Lessons out of these Books can never be so omitted. And forasmuch as it is impossible that the whole Bible should be read through on *Sundays* and Holidays, without making the Service tiresome, is the Church to be blamed (since it was obliged to leave out some parts of the Scripture on those Days) to leave out some of those Books, whose Contents were least useful for a vulgar Auditory? And as for those Chapters out of the *Apocrypha*, which are appointed to be read on some Holidays, (for not one of them is appointed for a *Sunday*) I defy any one to shew any thing *fabulous in them, or which favours too much of the adored*

adored Vanities of Gentiliſm, as *De Laune* has thought fit to ſay they do. For the Leſſons appointed to be read out of the *Apocrypha* on ſome Holidays, are only a few choſen Chapters out of the Books of *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus*, which contain no fabulous Stories, but only ſome excellent moral Precepts agreeable to what we find in the holy Scriptures.

And now if a Book ſtuffed with Lies and Falſhoods, as I think I have ſufficiently ſhewn this of *De Laune*'s to be: Or made up of colluſive, ſophiſtical Arguments, as you have evidently proved that this Book is, which the Diſſenters have ſo long and ſtill do cry up as unanſwerable, *be perfect in it ſelf* and ſuch as *never Author left behind him a more finiſhed Piece*, as *De Foe* tells us in his Preface: Then let the *Diſſenters* go on ſtill to boaſt of it; and as *De Foe* adds, *If any Man ask what they ſay, why the Diſſenters differ from the Church of* England, *and what they can plead for it? Let them reply, read* Thomas De Laune's *Book*. But if ſuch a Book is ſcandalous, and pernicious to the very Cauſe it pretends to defend, ſince that which is juſt and good can never need Lies and Sophiſms to ſupport it, then ſince thoſe notorious Lies and Sophiſms are now ſo clearly diſcovered, it is to be hoped that all thoſe Diſſenters who have any Affection to the Truth, will hereafter be aſhamed of ſuch a Champion, who has indeed betrayed their Cauſe, by ſhewing the World that it is not to be maintained by a fair and honeſt diſcovery of Truth, but that it ſtands in need of an Heap of Lies and Calumny to preſerve it from ſinking. And it looks as if the Body of the Diſſenters at the Time when the Book was written had

had that Opinion of it, which might be the Reaſon that they ſuffered the Author with his Wife and two Children to ſtarve in Gaol for ſo ſmall a Sum as 100 Marks, as *De Foe* upbraids them that they did. But the *Diſſenters* having by this time been beaten out of all their Tricks and Subterfuges, they now think it proper to make Lies their Refuge, and therefore cry up *De Laune*'s Book, which they were at firſt aſhamed of.

But *De Foe* exclaims loudly againſt the Government, which took occaſion, as he ſays, to anſwer *De Laune* by a Fine and Gaol. And I muſt confeſs it might be thought very hard dealing if the Book had been written with any tolerable Modeſty or Honeſty. But conſidering that the Book is ſtuffed with ſuch an Heap of Lies, and moſt ſcandalous and untrue Reflections both on the *Primitive Church* and that eſtabliſhed by Law; and ſuch as the Author himſelf, being a Scholar, could not but know to be Falſhoods, at leaſt ought to have known whether they had been ſo or not, before he had publiſhed them to the World to deceive the Ignorant, I cannot think the uſage he met with ſo very hard and undeſerved. For it is ridiculous to ſay that his writing this Book was only to anſwer Dr. *Calamy*'s Challenge. The Doctor only exhorted the Diſſenters *fairly and impartially to examine the Merits of the Cauſe, and the Grounds of thoſe Differences which were between them and the Church*; and had *De Laune* done no more than this, he might perhaps have heard again from Dr. *Calamy*; but I dare ſay he had been ſafe enough from the Government. But when inſtead of fairly examining the Cauſe, *De Laune* only made it his Buſineſs to throw

throw Dirt at the Church, and to load it with ſcandalous and falſe Aſperſions, it was but juſt that he ſhould be anſwered in another Way than the Doctor was capable of anſwering him. For it is a Jeſt to ſuppoſe that there ought to *be ſuch a Liberty of Conſcience*, as may give Men leave to utter what Lies or Untruths they pleaſe againſt the Religion eſtabliſhed by Law. For though I would by no Means have any one ſuffer for worſhipping God according to his Conſcience, yet I think no Man can pretend to plead Conſcience for Lying and Slandering; or if he ſhould, I cannot think it fit that ſuch a Plea ſhould be allowed. And this ſeems to have been plainly *De Laune*'s: Who becauſe he ſuffered as a Lyer and Slanderer (which I conceive I have ſufficiently proved him to have been) is by *De Foe* reckoned a Martyr for the Diſſenter's Cauſe.

I ſhall only add, that I think both you and I have beſtowed a great deal more Time and Pains upon this Book than it deſerves. But foraſmuch as *De Foe*, and (as you inform me) the *Obſervator* before him have recommended it to the World, as a moſt finiſhed and unanſwerable Performance, whoſe Recommendations (though little worth in themſelves) are not only of great Weight amongſt all the Diſſenters in general, but likewiſe have and may yet miſlead many harmleſs and well-meaning Perſons who cannot diſcover the Falſity of his Quotations, nor ſee through the Weakneſs of his Arguments; and whereas the Book it ſelf (as *De Foe* ſays) has already had at leaſt ſeven Impreſſions, and the Diſſenters make great uſe of it to ſeduce the ignorant and unwary, by telling them that it has yet received no Anſwer; I think it is very expedient that

that what you have written on this occaſion ſhould be publiſhed. And foraſmuch as you have only anſwered the argumentative Part, and taken but little notice of his falſe and inſincere Quotations, and his Miſrepreſentations both of the primitive Church and our own, I deſire that what I have here written may be alſo publiſhed with your Book. And then I truſt we may ſay that *Thomas De Laune*'s Book is fully anſwered.

I am

Spring-Grove,
Mar. 17. 17$\frac{1}{18}$.

Your hearty Friend
and Servant,

THO. BRETT.

THE

THE

BULWARK STORMED:

In Answer to

THOMAS DE LAUNE's

Plea for the Non-Conformists.

THE PREFACE.

I Think it may not be amiſs in the firſt place to let the Reader know, that the Author of this ſmall Treatiſe is one, that had the misfortune to be educated in the Principles of the Diſſenters: And tho' I have upon good Reaſons (as I think) ſince left them, yet I think I ſhould not act as becomes me, unleſs I vindicate (as far as I am able) the Cauſe I have eſpous'd; and let my Friends ſee, that the Book, in which they ſo much triumph, is inſufficient to accompliſh the end for which they have ſo many times ſent it to me.

They know Religion is a very ſacred thing; and he that is eaſily frighted out of one, may be as inconſiderately frighted into another. Notwithſtanding this, I cannot think that Religion true, that will not ſtand the ſtricteſt Tryal: Neither do I think that Man ever will, nay can be an Ornament to a Religion, the Principles of which he is unacquaint-

ed with: And tho' I cannot say that, when I left the Dissenters, I was so well acquainted with the Tenets of the one or the other Party as I now am; yet it is my comfort, that I can now look back and see, that I have not the least reason to repent my change.

Religion, I say, is a thing of the most moment and concern in the World; and therefore requires our most unwearied diligence to know and practise according to the mind and will of God. Why else should we be commanded to search and try our ways, if it were a matter of indifferency which way we walk'd in? And so, if it were a matter of indifferency what we heard, or how we heard, or with whom we joyn'd in religious Worship; I can't think why we shou'd be commanded to try the Spirits, and to examine the Doctrines too; and to mark them which cause Divisions, &c. *if it were not in order to avoid them.*

Knowledge is what most Men desire: But the knowledge of divine Things is charming sweet; tho' but few Men, in comparison, will be at the trouble of seeking after it. What pains will Men take to gain a little Wealth in this World! Their thoughts are, as it were, wholly taken up about it: And at the same time they think they may safely pass over, or at least not be so inquisitive about points of Religion; since they agree with most in the belief of a God, and of his Son Christ. 'Tis true, those are the chief Articles, but those are not all the chief: For I conceive a Man may believe them; *and yet hold other things that may be damnable Heresies. For,*

With submission to better Judgments, I think it not enough to believe aright in one or two points of Christian Doctrine; but he must live in the unity of

of the Faith, and in the community of the Church: I mean, in Communion with the lawful Bishops, who only have Authority from Christ to administer his Ordinances to us: And since Christ has confin'd his Ordinances to his Church; we can have no reason to expect them elsewhere.

I know that what I here assert is condemn'd by most of the Dissenters; but that's no Argument that it is not true. The Doctrine of the Trinity may be, nay is condemn'd by many, but that does not prove *the Doctrine to be false. 'Tis my Opinion (and I believe I have good reasons to confirm it) that if any Man, or Party of Men, (believing some points, as our Dissenters now do very truly) shou'd have (as they now do) separated him or themselves from the* primitive *Church, (that is, from the Bishops, for they were then thought Terms synonimous) they wou'd have been cut off by the publick Censure of the Catholick Church, and look'd on as Men in a desperate Condition; tho' in most points of Faith their belief had been orthodox: And this seems evident from the very notion of a Church.*

For if we consider the Church as a Society of Men (the whole diffusive Body of Christians) living in Communion with Christ their Head, as well as with each other; we must also consider that this Society is establish'd on proper Laws, by which it is able to support and defend itself: And as this Society must be supposed to be invested with power to bestow all the Benefits granted to it by the Founder, on such Persons in that Society, as shall be thought worthy of them; so must it also be supposed to have power to receive in, and exclude out of it, all those who are unwilling to be govern'd by the Laws of it. Let us farther consider, that Christ's Church (the diffusive Body of Christians) is but one Society;

and that it is abſolutely neceſſary that all Societies have ſome Government; and it will neceſſarily follow, that he that founded this Society, founded alſo the Government of it. Now in all Governments we know, there are the Governors, and the Governed; ſome to receive, and ſome to be received, according to that Form which is preſcrib'd by the Founder of that Society. As therefore no Man can be made or admitted a Member of a Corporation, but by the proper Officers of it appointed for that purpoſe; who is alſo inroll'd according to Cuſtom: So neither can any be admitted into Chriſt's Church or Society, but by thoſe who have authority to receive them in ſuch manner as the great Donor hath appointed. And as no Man can reaſonably expect to partake of the Privileges of a Corporation to which he does not belong: So no one can have any juſt ground to hope to receive the benefits which Chriſt hath promis'd to his Church, 'till ſuch time as he is a regular Member of it. I pray obſerve it, Reader, there is but one Saviour, and there is but one Church; as there is but one Church, ſo there is but one Baptiſm; as there is but one initiative Baptiſm, ſo none can adminiſter it, but thoſe that were and are ſent to do it: And as there is but one Baptiſm, ſo there is but one Faith that muſt bring us to that one God and Father of us all, to that one Salvation which we expect by Chriſt Jeſus.

There is indeed a ſort of Latitudinarians now among us, who go about to make the World believe, that this one Church is a compound of twenty or thirty different Sects and Parties; whoſe Principles and Practices mutually contradict and overturn each other: But if ſo, what do they mean by the Catholick Church? What may we reaſonably underſtand the Apoſtle to intend; when he ſpeaks of one Faith, and

and one Baptiſm? Can it be thought that he meant no more by it than one Article *of Faith? No ſure! For as then there was but one Baptiſm, ſo neither was there but one common Faith profeſs'd by all Chriſtians: And we find in after Ages, when erroneous Opinions were broach'd in the World, the Biſhops of the ſeveral Churches with one Voice condemn'd them; and if the Broachers of them perſiſted in them, they were by publick Cenſure cut off from the Communion of the Catholick Church. But if our Libertines have a juſt notion of the Catholick Church, the primitive Chriſtians were a pack of fools to give themſelves ſo much trouble, and take ſuch long journeys to meet in Councils to condemn an erroneous Opinion; and by publick Cenſure to cut off from the Church thoſe who troubled it, if when they had done, their Adverſaries cou'd bid them defiance, and ſet up ſeparate Meetings, and yet be as much in the Catholick Church, as they were before the Sentence was paſſed on them. But the truth is, they were not Latitudinarians. He that in thoſe days was not with the Biſhop, was not thought to be in the Church; and therefore not in the only known Covenant-Way of Salvation: And whether the primitive Fathers, or our modern Gentlemen, are to blame, judge ye. I verily believe if many, nay if any of our Sects had appear'd in the primitive times, the Biſhops would (immediately upon the notice of it) have met in Council and condemn'd them, and cut them off from the Chriſtian Church: And farther I verily believe, had* De Laune *liv'd in the primitive Ages of the Church, and publiſh'd ſuch Notious as he has in his Plea, (as Apoſtolick as his Friends think them to be) he would have had a much greater, at leaſt a much more inſupportable Fine laid upon him: And had* De Foe, *the* Pub-

liſher, *or the* Obſervator *then eſpouſed it, as they have now done, they might have ſhar'd with him in the ſame Fate, they would then have found* High-Church-Men *enough to have anſwer'd it with terrible Anathema's: But I have no ſuch Authority, and ſo ſhall not in that Method proceed againſt it, but I hope to give it a ſufficient Anſwer notwithſtanding, and in ſuch a way as I hope may be of uſe to my Reader.*

I hope my Reader is not infected with the common evil of the Age; to judge of Books by the Name of the Author; and to meaſure Arguments by the vogue of Parties; if you are, there is little hopes that any Arguments will do you good; for that which is now the darling of your Affections, will in all probability determine your Actions: And ſo (ſuppoſing you to be in a Miſtake) you are like to be always what they will have you.

But I will hope better things of you my Reader; that thou art one who art a lover of Truth, and willing to hear both ſides impartially; and if ſo, let us go on, and I pray God we may both be ſo happy as to diſcover and imbrace the Truth. I could (for my Readers ſake) wiſh, I were better qualified for this Undertaking: But if my Cauſe have a bad Advocate; it is ſtill my comfort, I have a good Cauſe to plead for; and I truſt I ſhall manage it ſo, that the meanneſs of the Style; ſhall be no juſt Reaſon for the judicious to reject it; when they ſee the Arguments ſolidly made good; and ſo ſhall anſwer my own end; tho' not in all reſpects (conſidering ſome Readers) my own Wiſhes.

Had this Treatiſe been more learnedly handled; it might have merited perhaps the acceptance and applauſe of ſome, that will in all probability reject it now: But I am not at all concerned for that;

for

for as I ſtudy'd not for applauſe, ſo I can loſe nothing in miſſing it : If my Arguments are truly valid, and clearly deciſive in the preſent Caſe; I ſhall be the leſs concerned for the meanneſs of the Style : Eſpecially conſidering, had the Style been more Scholaſtick, this Treatiſe might have been leſs uſeful to thoſe, for whom I chiefly intended it.

I will ſuppoſe my ſelf one, that hath no intereſt in the Reader : But withal I'll ſuppoſe, I am not excluded from his affections : And ſo I am content to ſtand or fall in the affections of the Reader, according to the ſtrength or weakneſs of the Arguments contained in this Treatiſe : For it paſſes with me for a prov'd Caſe; that no Authority of Man whatſoever or whoſoever, can make that true which is not ſo; for whatever they can ſay, is either true or falſe before they ſay ſo; and conſequently their ſaying of it adds nothing to its Authority : And therefore I hope my Reader will not barely rely on what is ſaid on either ſide; but impartially conſider who gives the beſt Reaſons for what he aſſerts.

I pretend not to ſay of this Undertaking of mine, as De Foe *does of* De Laune's Plea; The Book is perfect of it ſelf, *&c. no; all that I can ſay of it is, that the Arguments therein contained, do convince me, that* De Laune's Plea *is a very ſcandalous Piece; and that Men do but betray their own weakneſs in ſo highly commending it. For ſurely one would think, Men would conſider their own Reputation more than to boaſt of a Book's being* unanſwerable, the Bulwark of the Diſſenters Cauſe, a finiſh'd Piece, *&c. if there were not ſome thing extraordinary in it : And yet when we come nicely to examine into this wonderful thing;*

it

it is only a Mountain brought forth a Mouſe: And I hope Mr. De Foe *and the reſt of his Friends will be ſo kind as to take care of it.*

This Book of De Laune's *you muſt know, Reader, was ſtopt in the Preſs in King* Charles's *time; but was afterwards publiſh'd by a Friend of his (as he tells us in the Preface to a former Edition; in anſwer to which theſe Papers were at firſt penn'd) who was his Fellow-priſoner: But whether afterwards or before, or both, I will not diſpute, not having that Preface by me at this time, the* Obſervator *took on him the Guardianſhip of this Piece; and in his publick Papers told his Countryman, that all the high Church Men in* England *could not anſwer it; and of late Mr.* De Foe, *it ſeems, is made Maſter-keeper of this extraordinary Piece; and truly I think no Man ſo fit; for no Man has ſhewn a greater reſpect for the Author or his Work, than he: Nay, he has placed his whole dependence on thoſe Arguments; and if they ſhould chance to fail, he declares he can give no better Reaſons why he diſſents from the Church of* England; *and therefore I hope he will publiſh his Recantation, or ſhew me the inſufficiency of my Arguments.*

I think it may not be amiſs to let my Reader know, that notwithſtanding I had drawn up this Anſwer to De Laune's *Plea before I ſaw Mr.* De Foe's *Edition; yet ſince that is the laſt, and perhaps the moſt common; therefore in all my References I have had an eye to it.*

Another thing there is, with which I think fit to acquaint my Reader; and that is, that there came out (ſince the publiſhing of De Foe's *Edition) an Anſwer to this* Plea *of* De Laune's *by Mr.* Robertſon, *which at firſt made me hope I might be excuſed from publiſhing theſe Reaſons: But ſince I find*

find that Piece is not like to pass current among them; as a sufficient Answer to the before-said Plea *: And since my Friends do still insist on my Promise of doing it, I have resumed my former Resolutions of publishing it, and have made use of some few Remarks, for which I have been beholden to that Gentleman.*

I have but one thing more to desire of my Reader: And that is, that he will read this Treatise, with the same Charity that I pen it; that he would not let Party or Passion, but Reason be judge in this Case; which if he does, I conceive good hopes this Undertaking of mine, will not only convince him that I have not left the Dissenters without a Cause; but he will see that he has all the Reason in the World to do so too: And if this small Treatise shall be of any Service to strengthen those that are in, or to persuade any that are out of the Church of England *to come in and join with her; I shall think my self very happy, (if so happy I may be) to be the least Instrument of so much good to them, and that God would be pleased so to bless it to thee,* kind Reader, *both is, and shall be, the hearty Prayer of him, that wisheth thee a right Judgment in all things that belong to thy eternal Peace: Even so prayeth he that is in all humility thy Christian Friend,*

EDW. HART.

THE

THE INTRODUCTION.

IT has been an old as well as common Obſervation, that as Men decay in Zeal towards what St. *James* [a] calls *pure Religion and undefiled before God*; ſo they grow hot and eager Contenders for that, which as St. *Paul* ſays, [b] *profiteth little*, and in their Diſputes contend more for *Victory* than *Truth*. For which reaſon, I think there is nothing to which ſuch Men may more fitly be compar'd, than thoſe Phariſees our Saviour ſpeaks of, [c] *who were very ſtrict in tithing Mint, Aniſe, and Commin, when at the ſame time they neglected the weightier matters of Religion.*

It is indeed a very ſad, but yet great Truth (too plain to be denied; becauſe it ſo plainly appears in our Books of diſpute) that, when Men are eagerly contending about the outward Form; they almoſt, nay, ſome do altogether forget that

[a] Chap. i. 27. [b] 1 *Tim.* iv. 8. [c] *Mat.* xxiii. 23.

which

which is so much better in it self, and therefore ought to be of far greater account with us, *viz.* that in which the Sum and Substance of Religion does consist; I mean that *most excellent gift of Charity, the very bond of Peace, and of all Vertues: Which whosoever wants is counted dead before God.* Nay, St. *Paul* has plac'd all Religion in it; [d] *he that loveth another*, saith he, *hath fulfilled the Law:* And a greater than he has made it the distinguishing badge of Christians; *by this shall all Men know*, says our *Saviour*, [e] *that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another:* And St. *John* expressly says, *he that loves not his Brother abideth in death.* [f] But how great a Duty soever Charity may be in it self, or how necessary soever it is in order to Peace, we by experience find some (and them not a few) so divested of it, as to condemn all but those of their own Party. And it were well if in this particular, their Practice did not keep pace with their Principles; but since wicked Practise is but the genuine effect of wicked Principles, how can I expect kind Actions from him who cannot afford me a kind Thought? He that judges my Religion to be Popish, Superstitious, Paganism, *&c.* if he be one that is not in love with those things, what will he not do to remove it? and as his Thoughts and Actions are towards my Religion, so in all probability will they be towards me.

'Tis true (the corruption of humane Nature consider'd) most of our Disputes about Religion have a tendency to dissolve, if not destroy the Peace of the Church: But sure the Persons who

---

[d] *Rom.* xiii. 8. [e] xiii. 35. [f] 1 *John.* iii. 14.

ingage

ingage therein, might (if they would) manage them so, as not to destroy the very being of it.

How happy might we of this Nation be, could we heartily put in practice what St. *Paul* recommends to his *Phillipians*, [g] *to be of one accord, and of one mind*, and in matters of Religion *all speak and do the same thing*, that there might no longer be any Divisions among us: But in case we cannot be so happy as we should, yet let us come as near to it as we can, by taking the same Apostle's advice, [h] *And whereunto we have already attainted, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.*

There are too many in the World who foment, too few who compose our Divisions; many who pull down, but few who build up; many (if we may judge of their Principles by their Practice) who endeavour to set the House of God on fire; but few, God knows, very few, who are solicitous to extinguish it.

I am not so vain as to think the World stands in need of what I can say or do with respect to this Subject: No, I know there has been enough said by our reverend Clergy before now: But if any use that as an Argument against this Undertaking of mine, and thence conclude, that I have no occasion to say any thing on a Subject, that has been so well and so often spoken to by so many able Pens: Why, this I must confess is very true, there is no occasion for me to say any thing more, if we have regard to the Subject it self: But if they consider that I was brought up a Dissenter, and since I have left them, have had *De Laune's Plea* for the *Nonconformists* at

[g] Chap. ii. 2. [h] Chap. iii. 16.

three

three ſeveral times ſent and lent me as an unanſwerable Piece, and have been ſo often times urged to ſhew my Reaſons, why the Arguments therein uſed, have not prevailed with me to leave the *Church* of *England* and again be one of them: (For *De Laune* has ſaid, and they ſay he proves, that the Church of *England* is a ſuperſtitious Synagogue of *Satan*, an *Image* of the *Beaſt*, and a Limb of *Anti-chriſt*; and therefore I ſhould come out of her and be ſeparate:) He, I ſay, that conſiders this, and withal conſiders that I had obliged my ſelf by promiſe to anſwer their Requeſt, will I hope excuſe me for making an attempt to anſwer a Book, ſo much cry'd up by them for an unanſwerable Piece.

But by their leave I muſt remind them, of what they cannot be ignorant, that Perſons and things do not always prove to be what ſome Men are pleaſed to call them. For common Experience ſhews, that moſt Men judge of things not as they really are, but as they are repreſented to them by ſome conceited Men of their own Party: For which Reaſon I think it ought to be well conſider'd, whether their ſo much admired *Plea*, may not be of the number of things that are ſo reputed.

As to *De Laune's Plea*, I am really of Opinion, it had never been ſo much in vogue among them, if the *Publiſher* had not told them that it was the *Bulwark* of their *Cauſe*: And the Obſervator had not affirm'd, that all the *high Church Men* in *England* could not anſwer it. And to help the matter forward, I find Mr. *De Foe* (in his Preface to the late Edition of this *Plea*) [i] tel-

[i] Pag. 1.

ling

ling us, that it has been publiſh'd at leaſt ſeven times; " and without doubt, ſays he, if the Ad- " verſaries of the Diſſenters were for coming to " the Teſt, either of *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, or *Anti-* " *quity*, it would before now have receiv'd ſome " anſwer. And farther, he ſays, there remains " nothing to be added to the Argument, till ſome " attempt to confute them (the Diſſenters) ſhall " make a rejoinder neceſſary; nor indeed can " the Diſſenters deſire to have their Caſe more " fairly ſtated, or the Conduct of their Adverſa- " ries be more concurring to their Juſtification. And *pag.* 15. he ſays, " He ſhall make no Apo- " logy for writing his Preface, but what the Rea- " der will allow reaſonable; for the Book is per- " fect of it ſelf, ſays he, never Author left be- " hind him a more finiſh'd piece, and I believe " the Diſpute is entirely ended: If any Man there- " fore ask what we can ſay, why the Diſſenters " differ from the *Church* of *England*, and what " they can plead for it? I can, ſays he, recom- " mend no better Reply than this, let them an- " ſwer in ſhort *Thomas De Laune*, and deſire the " *Queriſt* to read the Book. From all which, and much more that might be added to the ſame Effect, (from others as well as from him) it plain- ly appears what a mighty opinion thoſe Men have conceiv'd of this Plea; and particularly Mr. *De Foe* has given ſuch a Character of it, as would make a modeſt Man bluſh, were he never ſo well affected to it; becauſe the Character thus given by him is ſuch, as is not compatible with any rational Undertaking.

I muſt confeſs, I had finiſh'd what I intended to ſay in anſwer to *De Laune*, before I ſaw Mr. *De Foe*'s Edition and Preface; but becauſe I find him

ſo

ſo far bigotted to, and ſo loud in his boaſt of, this Plea; I muſt beg leave (in this place) to make an Obſervation or two on what he ſays concerning it; before I come to acquaint the Reader with the Method I have taken, in examining the Book it ſelf.

Firſt then, *De Foe* (in order to applaud *De Laune*'s Performance) is willing to put us in mind of the neceſſity there then was for ſome body to put forth a Plea on the behalf of the Diſſenters; who (as he ſays) were then commonly inſulted by the *High Church Party*. Secondly, that this was neceſſary on the account of Dr. *Calamy*'s Challenge then made, ſays he, to the whole Body of Diſſenters. And then, Thirdly, from the Effect, he goes on to infer the Neceſſity of the Cauſe.

As to the time in which this *Plea* was firſt publiſh'd; "it was, ſays he, [k] when the Ene-"mies of the Diſſenters Forces were drawn up, "and were inſulting to ſuch a degree, as to ſtrike "at the Foundation of Religion. When ſhould "the Champions of Religion defend her, but "when they find the Foundation ſtruck at? "When ſhould *David* take up his Sling againſt "*Goliah*, but when he found him defying the "Hoſts of *Iſrael?* Then is the only proper time I muſt confeſs; but how, and who were thoſe *Goliah*'s that thus defy'd the Hoſts of *Iſrael*; that thus inſulted the Diſſenters, and ſtruck at the Foundation of their Religion? Why read on and you'll find the Anſwer in Dr. *Calamy*'s Challenge, which (as he ſays) was then made to the whole Body of Diſſenters. "Could we, ſays "the Doctor, thus prevail with the People, di-

[k] *Preface to* De Laune's Plea, *p.* 10.

" ligently to examine the Merits of the Cauſe, " our Church would every Day gain more ground " amongſt all wiſe Men; for we care not how " much Knowledge and Underſtanding our Peo- " ple have, ſo they be but humble and modeſt " with it, *&c.* Thoſe are the words of Dr. *Calamy*'s Challenge, which (in the judgment of Mr. *De Foe*) ſtruck at the Foundation of the Diſſenters Cauſe: If in this caſe then they had been ſilent, what could they have been thought leſs than obſtinate, and pertinaciouſly eſpouſing Notions they could not defend? Now tho' I think he ſpake this rather by Conjecture than the Spirit of Prophecy, yet I cannot ſee, why they are not in the ſame Danger ſtill; for ſince *De Laune* (their Champion) in anſwering, has ſadly neglected the Merits of the Cauſe; why ſhould they value themſelves for giving an Anſwer that is not to the purpoſe? But I ſhall leave the Proof of this till I have made an obſervation on the wonderful Effects that attended the publiſhing of this *Plea*, which were very great: For Mr. *De Foe* tells us, [1] " That they (the *High-Church-Men*) " are ſo far from making them (the Diſſenters) " any more Challenges, that they never made " the leaſt Reply to this; thus, ſays he, the Ne- " ceſſity and the Succeſs of this attempt make out " one another. A very terrible clap of Thunder indeed, to ſtrike all the *High-Church-Men* dumb at once! but now, Sir, the Tempeſt is over, and ſince there is now as a great Calm, let me have your Ear, while I offer ſomething by way of Reply to your Preface.

[1] *Preface to* De Laune's Plea, *p.* 10.

As for *De Laune's Plea* ſo much applauded by you, and others of your Party, as an unanſwerable piece; I think all hands muſt allow, that in this you beg the Queſtion.

Again, as to the Title, *(A Plea for the Non-Conformiſts)* it's too general; and therefore, ſince you intended to applaud the Performance, it was much you did not amend the Title; for its certain (as the Diſſenters caſe now ſtands) no one Book can be a proper Plea for them all; becauſe their Principles being ſo very different, that which juſtifies the Pretenſions of one ſort of Diſſenters, will (by contradiction of Principles) condemn all the reſt. For inſtance, *De Laune* ſeems at leaſt to oppoſe the *baptizing of Infants:* Now ſo far as he does oppoſe it, ſo far he oppoſes the *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, &c. and if he oppoſe, ſure he does not at the ſame time plead for them; and if he does not plead for them, how can this Book be called a *Plea for the Non-Conformiſts?* How then does Mr. *De Foe* make it appear, that *De Laune* dy'd a Martyr for a Cauſe in which the whole Body of Diſſenters were intereſted? What, an *Anabaptiſt*, and dye for that; and at the ſame time be a *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Quaker*, &c: and ſuffer as ſuch? What, die for the Defence of every thing, and at the laſt be juſt nothing? A worthy Martyr indeed! And what will they ſay, if this ſhould be prov'd to be his very caſe? I'll tell you the Story, and leave you to judge as you ſee cauſe.

De Laune in his *Plea* takes the part of the *Anabaptiſts*, and denies *Infant-Baptiſm*; and yet according to the beſt account I can get, he had his own Children baptized; which ſhews, that he did not either write or practiſe upon Principle.

Beſides, there is a certain Perſon of the *Anabaptiſt Party* now living, and truly I think he is one on whoſe word we may depend; he was (as he tells me) *De Laune*'s fellow-Priſoner for the Cauſe of *Non-Conformity*, and knew him very well; this Man ſays, there was in *Newgate* at that time (when *De Laune* was there) about eighty Perſons, Men and Women, among whom were about eight Miniſters; but few or none of us that car'd for his Company: For tho' he was a witty Fellow and a Scholar, yet he was a Man of little or no Religion! If this be true, was he not a worthy Martyr? If it be not true, my Author is a Diſſenter, and now alive to anſwer for it.

However, I give Mr. *De Foe* free liberty, not only to build a Monument over his Grave, but alſo to write what Inſcription he pleaſes on it, as well as on his Work; upon this condition only, that he will tell us in what reſpect *De Laune* may be truly ſaid to die a Martyr for the Cauſe in which the whole Body of Diſſenters are intereſted: For ſince it's certain (for the Reaſons before mention'd) they cannot all claim him as a Martyr for their Cauſe; and if Mr. *De Foe* cannot ſhew which Party among them may claim him, I conceive it's very improbable that the whole Body of Diſſenters ſhould ever joyn and erect a Monument over him; (for what reaſon can be given why I ſhould contribute toward erecting a Monument over a Man that was not of my Sentiments?) It may be this was the reaſon why they did not raiſe him Money to pay his Fine; but whether it were or not, it is certain, ſince they did not agree in doing that, there is little reaſon to believe they will ever agree to do the other.

Whether Mr. *De Foe* have any Reaſons to offer for the confirmation of what he aſſerts (in the before-mention'd Caſe) I know not; probably his word muſt paſs inſtead thereof: However, a common Cauſe it ſeems they have, in which (like *Herod* and *Pilate)* they all unite againſt the *Church* of *England*, let the Differences amongſt them in other reſpects be what they will.

Now the common Principle on which all the Diſſenters unite againſt the *Church* is, as *De Laune* tells us, [m] *That nothing is lawful in the worſhip of God, but what he has expreſſly commanded:* If then this be the common Principle in which they all unite againſt the *Church*, as *De Laune* intimates; and if he ſuffer'd for defending their common Cauſe, as Mr. *De Foe* affirms; then it neceſſarily follows, (as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) that he ſuffer'd for the defence of a Cauſe which is directly contradictory, Firſt, to the Practice of the Diſſenters themſelves. Secondly, to Reaſon and the intent of Laws. Thirdly, to plain Fact recorded in Scripture. And Fourthly and laſtly, to the known Practice of the *Church* of *Chriſt* in all Ages. And if ſo, was it not a worthy Cauſe to ſuffer for? Was not he a worthy *Martyr* that ſuffer'd for ſuch a Cauſe?

But Mr. *De Foe* inſinuates, (contrary to what *De Laune* himſelf affirms) that this was not the Reaſon, at leaſt not the only one, that engag'd *De Laune* to the Undertaking, for doing of which he was impriſon'd: What then? Why he ſays the *Diſſenters* were then generally and frequently challeng'd and inſulted by the *High-Church Party to that degree, as to ſtrike at the very Foundation of*

[m] *De Laune's Plea*, p. 6.

their Religion. But pray who were those *High-Church-Men* who thus insulted them? If the High-Church Party insulted them without the Churches consent, why does he level his Arguments against the *Church* it self, which did not insult them? If the *Church* and *High-Church Party* be terms synonymous, sure they were not greatly insulted, since Dr. *Calamy* is the only one named (of all the *High-Church Party)* that insulted them: And truly I think, if the Doctor's Words and *De Laune*'s Performance, be both well consider'd, it's not much for their credit to mention him as their Insulter.

For how does he insult them? After what manner does he strike at the Foundation of their Religion?

Why thus, *Could we thus prevail with the People, diligently to examine the Merits of the Cause, equally hear both sides, and think it no shame to change their Minds when they see good reason for it: For we do not desire Men to become our Proselytes,* says the Doctor, *any farther than we shew them Scripture and good Reason for it,* &c. Now this is what Mr. *De Foe* calls challenging and insulting the Dissenters, and striking at the Foundation of their Religion; which is a great Complement put upon them, I must confess! What, Mr. *De Foe,* is it an Insult offer'd to the Dissenters, to put them in mind of the Merits of the Cause? Is Ignorance the Mother of Devotion among them too? If not, why should you be apprehensive that the Foundation of their Religion will be undermined, and the Superstructure destroy'd, if People should (by equally hearing both sides) grow more wise and knowing? Is a strict and impartial examination of the Principles of Religion, such

ſuch a deadly Enemy to their Cauſe? If ſo, I fear their Cauſe is not good: If adviſing them to lay by all Affection to, or Love of a Party, and meekly and modeſtly to hear both ſides without any prejudicate Opinion; and to embrace that which on ſuch an impartial examination they find moſt rational and conformable to Scripture; if this, I ſay, be inſulting them, they may ſtill expect to be inſulted; for many of them ſeldom think, much leſs examine the Merits of the Cauſe: And thoſe among them that have made an attempt this way, particularly *De Laune*, have notwithſtanding ſadly neglected it.

I ſhall now take my leave of Mr. *De Foe*, for ſome time; and from him transfer my Diſcourſe to thoſe Perſons who have at three ſeveral times (in boaſting manner) ſent this *Plea* to me as an *unanſwerable piece*; and when I have ſo done, I will proceed to my propos'd method.

As for thoſe Perſons who ſent me this *Plea*, I muſt beg leave to tell them, I am afraid that they themſelves have not ſo fully examin'd it as they ought; however, this I can and do aſſure them, I have (according to their requeſt) carefully read it over and over, and according to the beſt Judgment I can make, it has little Argument in it.

I ever have, and ever will pay a due reſpect to the Opinions of ſober and good Men; but for all that, I muſt ask their pardon, if (in points of Religion) I believe them not, farther than they give me Scripture and good Reaſon for it. And as without this, I will believe none; ſo neither without it do I deſire any to believe me: Therefore all that I require of them is, that they would

ſuſpend their Judgments for the preſent, and impartially hear what I have to offer in oppoſition to *De Laune's Plea*, before they condemn either; and ſince it cannot be deny'd, but this is a very reaſonable Requeſt; I ſhall conclude with a Preſumption that it will not be deny'd.

THE

THE

Bulwark Stormed.

WHEN once unanſwerable Books appear in the World, we may reaſonably hope, that Men will leave diſputing, and in good earneſt betake themſelves to practice: But till ſuch time as Men know which way to go, it cannot be expected they will make any great progreſs in their Journey.

Heaven is the Place it ſeems to which we would all go, but the Way thither we (moſt of us at leaſt) ſeem to be unacquainted with: For did we know it better, I cannot conceive why we ſhould chalk out ſo many quite different Ways to it. Now either it is a matter of Indifferency in which of thoſe Ways we walk in, or it is not; if it is, then, why ſhould there be ſo much diſpute about it? if it be not, then it is a matter of great Importance to take the right: But who is the proper Judge? who can direct aright? is the great Queſtion.

I muſt

I must confess (could we tell where to find him) an infallible Guide in this Case would be of great use: But since it is plain, they that have the most pretended to it, have been the farthest from it; (especially this performance of *De Laune*'s so much cry'd up by their Party as unanswerable, *&c.*) it cannot, I hope, be thought unreasonable to examine their Pretensions, which for Method's sake to avoid rambling after him, I shall do in the following manner.

First, I shall observe what Method he takes to frame Negative out of Affirmative Articles of Faith, and how he applies them.

Secondly, I'll inquire whether it is as he says, unlawful to use or do any thing in the Worship of God; which he has not in the Affirmative expressly commanded.

Thirdly, I'll shew, on what account the *Church* of *England* appoints the use of some indifferent Ceremonies in the Worship of God.

Fourthly, I'll shew from plain Fact, that thus to appoint the use of some indifferent Ceremonies in the Worship of God, is not destructive of the true nature of christian Liberty.

Fifthly, I'll examine, whether the *Church* of *England* (in point of Ceremonies) differs from the Practice of the *primitive Church*.

Sixthly and *lastly*, I'll inquire, whether it be any Crime in the *Church* of *England* to symbolize (so far as it doth) with the *Church* of *Rome*. And when they have gone with me through the Examination of these particulars; I am inclin'd to think they will find, I have given all that is essential in *De Laune's Plea* a due Consideration.

First,

First, Then for the Method he takes for framing Negative Articles of Faith out of Affirmative ones. He says, that every Affirmative includes a Negative Article of Faith, and from thence concludes, *pag.* 6. that nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, unless it be in the Affirmative expressly commanded. But this is a great Mistake For what tho', as he says, every Affirmative doth include a Negative? Yet since all (that know any thing of Logick) know, that the Negative of every Affirmative, and the Affirmative of every Negative is, and ever ought to be taken for that, and that only, which stands in a direct opposition to, either the Affirmative or Negative both in Substance and Circumstance: I cannot see, what *De Laune*'s Cause gains by his advancing this Proposition.

For instance, In the fourth Commandment we are commanded to keep holy the Sabbath-Day: What's the Negative of this Command? why, according to *De Laune*; *ergo*, all our Church Festivals are unlawful. But why so? I pray: because God having in the Affirmative, expressly commanded this Day to be set apart for his Worship and Service; hath excluded all other Days, by the Negative of that Command. But had this been so, how could the Jews themselves (unto whom this Command was given) appoint and observe (without any Command from God) the Feast of *Purim* [n] and of *Dedication* mentioned in the first Book of *Maccabees* [o], which notwithstanding this Command (to keep holy the Sabbath-Day) we are sure they did with approbation [p]; tho' by the way let me observe, that nei-

[n] *Est.* ix. [o] Chap. iv. 59. [p] *John* x. 22.

ther

ther of those Days had any more divine Sanction, than those now commonly called St. *Peter*'s or St. *Paul*'s. *De Laune* then was out in his application of this Maxim; for he should have considered, that the Affirmative of the fourth Commandment is confined to the Sabbath-Day, and therefore so ought the Negative to be likewise; and consequently the Negative of that Command, cannot be interpreted to the prejudice of our *Holy-Days*, more than to those other before named. From what Affirmative then can our Dissenters infer a Negative Prohibition against our *Holydays?* I take the freedom to ask the Question, and give them Liberty to take their own time to answer it: And when they give their Instance, I'll acknowledge my Mistake. But to proceed to another Instance.

Christ Jesus our *Lord* has in his *Gospel* commanded us to pray; what's the Negative of that Command? Why, according to *De Laune*, *ergo*, a *Form* of *Prayer* is forbid by the Negative. But why not as well, if not better, *ergo* an *extemporary Prayer* is so? or *ergo* to sit, stand or kneel in Prayer is forbid by the Negative of that Command, as well as *ergo* a Form is so? Sure I am, any of those Conclusions will be as good as the other, take which you will.

Again, our Lord *Christ* hath commanded his Followers to receive the Sacrament of his last Supper: Now what's the Negative of this Command? why, according to *De Laune*, *ergo* to kneel at the time of receiving it, is forbid by the Negative; but why not as well, *ergo* to sit, or *ergo* to use leaven'd, or unleaven'd Bread, or *ergo* to receive it in the Evening or in the Morning, *&c.* is forbid by the Negative of that Command, as well as *ergo* to

to kneel is so? For any of those *ergo's* would be but arguing from the Substance, the Manner, Kind or Quality of the Substance, which all know is uncertain and undeterminate. For,

If the Antecedent be of the Entity of a thing, it's certain the Conclusion ought not (by the Rules of Logick) to be, of the Manner, Kind or Quality of that Entity, because the terms ought to be equal, and have respect to the same thing under the same Circumstances; for changing the Terms and Circumstances of a thing, quite alters the State of the Question; which Distinction had *De Laune* observ'd, he never had made so wild an Application of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s words, as he hath now done, which I shall now spend some time in evincing; because *De Laune*, and his Party seem to flatter themselves, as if they had found a sufficient Foundation for their Negative Article of Faith in the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

In order to do this with the better Success, I must acquaint my Reader, upon what account it was that *De Laune* had reference to those words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, which (as he thinks) are so favourable to his Cause.

You must know then, that Dr. *Calamy* had in his Sermon entitl'd *Scrupulous Conscience*, pag. 19. affirmed, *that nothing was to be esteemed a Sin, but the doing something which the Law of God forbids, or omitting what it commands*; and from thence infers, *That our kneeling at the Sacrament, Forms of Prayer*, &c. *are all lawful, because not forbid by the word of God:* Which words of the Doctor brought him under the high Displeasure of *De Laune*; who (to confute the Doctor of his Error) cites Dr. *Stillingfleet* as his Antagonist; tho' by the way, this was only a Trick to evade the force

force of what he could not find Arguments to answer. But to how little purpose it was to cite Dr. *Stillingfleet*, as the Antagonist of Dr. *Calamy* will soon appear, if we apply our selves to the beforesaid Rule. For Dr. *Calamy* in the place cited, was speaking of indifferent Rites and Ceremonies, such as is the kneeling at the Sacrament, Forms of Prayer, *&c.* which, as he says, are all lawful, because not forbid by the Word of God: Now, it was in contradiction to this (as I observ'd before) that *De Laune* opposes him with the Authority of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who, in a certain Dispute with a Jesuit about the Rule of Faith (a point quite different from that in Question betwixt Dr. *Calamy* and he) affirms, *That the Scripture is our only plain, full and perfect Rule of Faith:* And thence concludes, *that we need not make Negative Articles of Faith; why? because the Affirmatives do necessarily include them*, says the Doctor: Very true, where the Affirmative is expressed; but where it is not, there can be no Negative inferr'd.

For what tho', as the Doctor affirms, the Negative is included in the Affirmative? If on the side of the Dissenters there be no Affirmative, commanding the use of those Customs now used among them (as I shall fully shew there is not when I come to the next particular) from what can they infer a Negative Prohibition, against the use of our Rites and Ceremonies? It's certain, where a Non-entity supplies the place of the Affirmative, there Privation will infallibly succeed in the place of a Negative. Now since he that opposes his Adversaries Argument, ought to do it with respect to the same, and not a different Subject; I cannot see for what reason he should oppose

poſe Dr. *Calamy* with the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; when it's certain his words have reſpect only to the Rule of Faith, not at all to the Ceremonies of Worſhip: Therefore ſince Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Affirmative was confin'd to Articles of Faith, ſo alſo in reaſon ought his Negative to be; and conſequently, it was a vain attempt to oppoſe Dr. *Calamy* with the authority of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s words, which had no relation to the Subject he was ſpeaking of: Unleſs they can make it appear, that Articles of Faith and Circumſtantials of Worſhip, are one and the ſame thing, and equally commanded in Scripture; which I think they will never be able to do. Why then does our Author triumph before he has got the Victory? Why does he boaſt of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s authority, as tho' the Doctor were come over to his ſide, and joyn'd Iſſue with him againſt Dr. *Calamy*; that nothing was lawful in the Worſhip of God (with reſpect to Circumſtantials of Worſhip) unleſs it be in the Affirmative expreſſly commanded, which is a thing the Doctor was never ignorant enough to imagine. Nay, why does he, *Judas* like, ſhake hands with the Doctor, as his very good Friend and Allie, and immediately turn his Praiſe into Ridicule and Banter? "For, what ſhall we ſay, ſays he, that "ſo wiſe, ſo great, and ſo learned a Man as "Dr. *Stillingfleet*, ſhould forget himſelf ſo far, "as to make head and run counter to his own Ar-"gument, and to that degree, as to pawn the "whole Controverſy on that ſingle point, which "he has notwithſtanding ſo infallibly reſolv'd, "(and therefore loſt nothing by the Venture)

P Page 7.

"which,

" which, says he, is very strange and wonderful!" I must confess it to be so, had the Doctor really done it; but since he has not, the wonder arises, not from Fact but Fancy.

But suppose the Doctor had really done it, yet why should he so much wonder at it, since it is a thing *Isaiah* had so long before prophesied of? [q] *I will do a marvellous Work amongst this People, even a marvellous Work and a Wonder*, (but what is that? says *De Laune*,) *Why the wisdom of their wise Men shall perish, and the understanding of the prudent Men shall be hid, but when shall that be? when their fear towards me is taught by the Precepts of Men:* Unto which he very judiciously adds our very Case! well, who can withstand the inevitable Decrees of Fate? If it be such an ominous thing, to be a wise and prudent Man as *De Laune* insinuates: It was a very happy Case, that this Prophecy did not at all concern him.

For, would any Body but he be so imprudent, as to laugh at Dr. *Stillingfleet* for pawning his Controversy on a single point, which was not only resolvable, but as he says, infallibly and indisputably resolv'd by the Doctor, and immediately do a great deal worse himself; even pawn the Dissenters Cause on a single point, that can never be resolved by any of them? Can he, I say, be called a wise Man that does this? Nay, but has he not done it? for, does he not tell us, [r] *That nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, unless it be in the Affirmative expressly commanded*; and then *says, the whole Controversy betwixt us depends on this single point?* Therefore now by consent let us here joyn Issue, and examine into the Merit of

[q] Chap. xxvii. 11. [r] *Plea*, pag. 6.

this

this Cauſe; and let his own words decide the matter, and for ever determine the Caſe; on which ſide ſoever (with reſpect to this ſingle Point) we find the truth, there to determine our Practice; and this leads me to what I propos'd,

Secondly, To enquire, whether it be unlawful to uſe or do any thing in the Worſhip of God, which he has not in the affirmative expreſſly commanded.

Now, in order to underſtand each other, with reſpect to the preſent caſe, I think it will not be amiſs to obſerve, what it was that gave *De Laune* an occaſion to advance this Propoſition. We muſt know then that Dr. *Calamy*, in a Diſcourſe call'd *Scrupulous Conſcience*, [s] aſſerts theſe two things; Firſt, "That with reſpect to the ſub-"ſtantial and eſſential Parts of God's Worſhip, the "Scripture is a plain and perfect Rule. Secondly, "That the outward Circumſtances of this Wor-"ſhip, as Time, Place, Habit, and Geſture, *&c.* "are not determin'd in the New Teſtament, as "they were in *Moſes*'s Law. With reſpect to the latter of theſe, *De Laune* oppoſes him and ſays, [t] "That Chriſt has in the affirmative com-"pleatly reveal'd his Mind and Will in the Bi-"ble; not only with reſpect to the Doctrine of "his Church, (as Dr. *Calamy* affirms) but alſo "with reſpect to the Diſcipline of it, which he "denies. It's plain then, when *De Laune* ſays that Chriſt hath compleatly reveal'd his Mind and Will in the Bible, (with reſpect to the Diſcipline of his Church) ſo that nothing is (in this reſpect) lawful, unleſs it be in the affirmative expreſſly commanded: He muſt be ſuppos'd to in-

[s] Pag. 19. [t] *Plea*, pag. 7.

tend the ſame thing by the Diſcipline of the Church, that Dr. *Calamy* did by outward Circumſtances of Worſhip, ſuch as Time, Place, Habit, Geſture, *&c.* becauſe this was the Point in difference betwixt them: And if he did not intend to oppoſe the Doctor's Argument in the plain and obvious Senſe, it was fooliſh to oppoſe him in a ſenſe wherein they had no difference: Taking it therefore for granted, that he did ſo oppoſe him; I ſhall now go on to enquire, whether ſomething of this nature may not be done in the Worſhip of God, tho' it be not in the affirmative expreſſly commanded: And if upon examination I find, that ſomething may be done that is not ſo commanded, then it is certainly falſe that nothing may be done; for unleſs they can make Contradictions agree, thoſe two can never both be, either true or falſe.

If then I can make it appear, that this Maxim of *De Laune*'s is contrary to, Firſt, the known practice of the Diſſenters themſelves. Secondly, to Reaſon and the intent of Laws. Thirdly, to plain Fact recorded in Scripture. And Fourthly, to the Practice of the primitive Church: If I can make this appear, I ſay, I hope they will own their Bulwark fairly taken; and the ſingle Point in which (as *De Laune* ſays) the true merits of the Cauſe did conſiſt, fully demonſtrated in favour of the Church of *England*; and conſequently if any ſhould for the future ask Mr. *De Foe*, or any of his Brethren, why they do not conform, and what they can ſay for it? What will their Anſwer be?———For Mr. *De Foe* has declar'd, he can make no better Reply to that Queſtion than that; which upon a ſtrict examination is found as bad, or worſe, than none at all.

Firſt

First then I'll begin with the Dissenters own Practice, and as I go shall take *De Laune*'s Maxim along with me; for nothing is lawful in the Worship of God (according to him) unless it be in the affirmative expressly commanded; but I say God has no where in the affirmative expressly commanded their Teachers always to Preach, and the People to pray standing; therefore if *De Laune*'s Maxim be true, their Practice (in those Particulars) are unlawful.

Again, Nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, says *De Laune*, unless it be in the affirmative expressly commanded: But I say, and so says Mr. *Baxter* [u]; they have no express affirmative Command for the use of an extemporary Prayer; therefore if *De Laune* say true, their Practice (in this particular likewise) is unlawful.

Nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, says *De Laune*, but that which is in the affirmative expressly commanded; but I say, (and so says Mr. *Manton* [w], one of their own Party) God has not so commanded them to sing Psalms in Metre; therefore their Practice in this particular also is unlawful.

Again, Nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, says *De Laune*, unless it be in the affirmative expressly commanded; but I say, God has no where expressly commanded them to use leavened (as it is oppos'd to unleavened) Bread in the Sacrament; therefore, in this particular likewise, their Practice is unlawful [x].

Again, Nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, says *De Laune*, but that which is in the affirma-

[u] *Christ. Direct.* Lib. 3. p. 11. [w] On *James* v. 13.
[x] See *Horneck's Crucify'd Jesus*, Chap. 7.

tive expreſſly commanded; but I ſay, (and ſo does Mr. *Baxter* [y]) God has no where in the affirmative expreſſly commanded the Diſſenters to receive the Sacrament ſitting; therefore in this particular alſo, if *De Laune* ſay true, their Practice is unlawful.

Again once for all, Nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God, ſays *De Laune*, but that which is in the affirmative expreſſly commanded; but I ſay, God has no where ſo commanded the Diſſenters to receive the Sacrament in the Evening; or to ſprinkle Children in Baptiſm, or to preach out of a Pulpit, *&c.* therefore either *De Laune*'s Principle is falſe, or the Diſſenters Practice is unlawful.

From what has been ſaid, we may obſerve, how much the Diſſenters are beholding to *De Laune*, for pawning their Cauſe on a ſingle Point that is ſo ſoon taken out of their Hands; nay, that's not all, for this Argument ſo much boaſted of by him as unanſwerable, and the Bulwark of the Diſſenters Cauſe; is indeed both unanſwerable and a ſtrong Bulwark, not for, but againſt their Practice, as is plain in the before mentioned Particulars.

For if nothing be lawful in the Worſhip of God, but that which is in the affirmative expreſſly commanded in Scripture, as *De Laune* affirms: And if the Diſſenters do thoſe things before mention'd in the Worſhip of God; then either the Diſſenters can ſhew where thoſe things are ſo commanded, or they cannot; if they cannot, then their Practice gives their Principle the lie; if they

---

[y] *Chriſt Direct.* Part 2. p. 111.

can,

can, let them do it, and I'll here promise them to be a Dissenter to Morrow.

But since I know it's not in their power to give any such proof, so I think it's very just to retort their Argument on them: If then God hath compleatly reveal'd his Will to us in the Bible, so that nothing is lawful in his Worship, unless it be in the affirmative expressly commanded, as *De Laune* affirms; and yet in that compleat Revelation of his Will, he hath not expressly commanded the Dissenters to use an extemporary Prayer, or leaven'd Bread in the Sacrament, or to receive it sitting, or in the Evening, *&c.* then the Dissenters in doing those things, do that in the Worship of God, for the doing of which they have no express Command in our only Rule of Faith; and consequently daily do that in the Worship of God which their own Champion has declar'd unlawful; but the former is true, *ergo* the latter.

And now give me leave a little to reflect on the common demand of the Dissenters: Where have you a Command for the use of this or that Ceremony, say they to us? Shew us, say they, an express Command of God for the use of them? Or we will by no means allow the use of them to be lawful. Fond conceit! What intolerable ignorance or prepossession is this? What, has God bound *us* to this Rule? And are *they* free from it? Is it a Sin in *us* to use or do any thing in the Worship of God, which he has not in the affirmative expressly commanded? And is it no Sin in them to do so? Nay, but *thou art inexcusable O Man*, says the Apostle [z], *whosoever thou art that judgest, for in that thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy*

[z] *Rom.* ii. 1.

ſelf; for thou that judgeſt, doeſt the ſame thing. What, will they plead not guilty to this? If they pleaſe, let them firſt anſwer me in theſe few queſtions if they can: Where have they an expreſs Command for the uſe of leaven'd Bread in the Sacrament? Where have they an expreſs Command to receive it ſitting, or in the Evening? Where do they find an expreſs Command for an extemporary Prayer? And in a word, where have they an expreſs Command for many other things us'd and done in the Worſhip of God; for the doing of which, they have no expreſs Command in our only Rule of Faith? If then they have no Command for the doing thoſe things, as it's certain none they have; then pray tell me, is not the doing of thoſe things in the Worſhip of God, a doing ſomething in his Worſhip, which is not expreſſly commanded by him? I pray them to conſider, whither this Principle will in the end drive them? As in this it makes them run counter to their own Practice; ſo it will make them in the next place, run counter to Reaſon and the intent of Laws: Which was the thing I propos'd Secondly to ſhew.

2. It is a Truth no leſs loudly taught by the voice of Reaſon, than plainly by the voice of Scripture, that *Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of a Law*; and conſequently there can be no Sin, where there is no Tranſgreſſion. For, if we may be ſaid to Sin, and yet not Tranſgreſs; or Tranſgreſs where there is no Law; then the Scripture which contains God's Royal Law, is not the only Standard of Sin and Duty; and the World is yet unacquainted with the true notion of Duty and Sin. However, let Sin be what it will, we are aſſur'd by St. *Paul*,

St. *Paul* [a], it is not imputed where there is no Law; and if it be not imputed, it will not hurt us, and therefore we need not fear it; for neither Nature, Reason, or Scripture, oblige us to fear any but hurtful things. Nay, St. *Paul* expressly says [b], he *had not known Sin, but by the Law*; and for my part I must confess, I am to this Day ignorant of any other Rule (than the Law of God contain'd in the Bible) by which it can be determin'd, what is Sin and what is not. And truly to me it is a plain case, and I believe all that will give themselves time and liberty to enter into a due consideration of the Nature, Reason, and intent of Laws, will soon be oblig'd to confess (from Principles of Reason, what the great St. *Paul* was instructed to assert from the Holy Spirit of God) that where there is no Law there is no Transgression; and where there is no Transgression, there is no Sin; and where there is no Sin, there can be no Punishment: For, says he, [c] *the Sting of Death is Sin, and the Strength of Sin is the Law; but thanks be to our God, through Jesus Christ our Lord*; who doubtless will not (with due Reverence be it spoken) find a Hand to punish us, for doing of what he did not think fit to find a Tongue to forbid us the doing of. And in this opinion I am somewhat confirm'd by the concurrent Testimonies of Mr. *Hooker*, Bishop *Taylor*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, &c. but because *De Laune* has cited Dr. *Stillingfleet* as a Partisan in this his Cause; I shall omit the Reasons of the former; and conclude this Head with the Testimony of the latter; who tells us, [d] "That in matters of

[a] *Rom.* v. 15. [b] *Rom.* vii. 7.
[c] 1 *Cor.* xv. 56. [d] *Irenicum*, pag. 7.

" mere Decency and Order in the Church of " God, or any other civil Action of the lives of " Men, it's enough, ſays he, to make things law- " ful if they are not forbidden, which he there " proves; firſt from the Intentions of God in " making known his Will, which was not to re- " cord every particular Fact done by himſelf, or " Chriſt, or his Apoſtles; but to lay down thoſe " general and ſtanding Laws whereby his Church " in all Ages ſhould be guided and rul'd; and in " order to a perpetual obligation upon the Con- " ſcience, there muſt be a ſufficient promulgati- " on of thoſe Laws which muſt bind Men.

" Thus in the caſe of Infants Baptiſm, it's a " very weak and unconcluding Argument to " ſay, that Infants are not to be baptiz'd, be- " cauſe we never read that Chriſt or his Apo- " ſtles did it; for this is a Negative in matter of " Fact: But on the other ſide, it's an evidence " that they are not to be excluded from Baptiſm, " becauſe there is no Divine Law which doth " prohibit their admiſſion into the Church by it, " for this is the Negative of a Law; and if it " had been Chriſt's intention to have excluded " any from admiſſion into the Church, who were " admitted before as Infants were; there muſt " have been ſome poſitive Law whereby ſuch an " intention of Chriſt ſhould have been expreſs'd; " for nothing can make that unlawful which was " a Duty before, but a direct and expreſs prohi- " bition from the Legiſlator himſelf, who alone " has Power to reſcind as well as to make Laws. " And therefore Antipædobaptiſts muſt, inſtead " of requiring a poſitive Command for baptizing " Infants, themſelves produce an expreſs Prohibi- " tion excluding them, or there can be no appea-

" rance

" rance of Reaſon given, why the Goſpel ſhould " exclude any from thoſe Privileges which the " Law admitted them to.

Secondly, " I argue from the intention and end " of Laws, which is to circumſcribe and reſtrain " the natural Liberty of Man by binding him " to the Obſervation of ſome particular Precepts. " And therefore where there is no particular " Command and Prohibition, it is in Nature and " Reaſon ſuppoſed that Men are left to their na- " tural Freedom, as is plain in poſitive humane " Laws, wherein Men by Compact and Agree- " ment for their mutual good in Societies, were " willing to reſtrain themſelves from thoſe things " which ſhould prejudice the good of the Com- " munity ; this being the Ground of Mens firſt " incloſing their Rights and common Privileges, " it muſt be ſuppoſed, that what is not ſo in- " cloſed, is left common to all as their juſt Right " and Privilege ſtill. So it is in Divine poſitive " Laws, God intending to bring ſome of Man- " kind to Happineſs, by Conditions of his own " appointing ; hath laid down many poſitive " Precepts, binding Men to the Practice of thoſe " things as Duties which are commanded by him. " But where we find no Command for Perfor- " mance, we cannot look upon that as an im- " mediate Duty, becauſe of the neceſſary rela- " tion between Duty and Law ; and ſo where " we find no Prohibition, there we can have " no ground to think that Men are debarr'd " from the doing things not forbidden. For " as we ſay of Exceptions, as to general Laws " and Rules, that an Exception expreſſed, *Fir-* " *mat regulam in non exceptis*, makes the Rule " ſtronger in things not expreſſed as excepted ;

" ſo

" ſo is it as to Divine Prohibitions; as to the Po-
" ſitives, that thoſe Prohibitions we read in Scrip-
" ture, make other things not prohibited to be
" therefore lawful, becauſe not expreſſly forbid-
" den: As God's forbidding *Adam* to eat of the
" Fruit of one Tree, did give him a Liberty to
" eat of all the reſt. Indeed, had not God
" at all reveal'd his Will and Laws to us by his
" Word, there might have been ſome Plea
" why Men ſhould have waited for particular
" Actions, not determin'd by the Law of Nature:
" But ſince God hath revealed his Will, there
" can be no Reaſon given why thoſe things
" ſhould not be lawful to do, which God hath
" not thought fit to forbid Men the doing of."
Thus far Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

This Paſſage, tho' ſomewhat long, I was the more willing to tranſcribe, not only becauſe *De Laune* has cited the Doctor as a Partiſan in his Cauſe, and therefore it's to be hoped they will take his Word; but alſo, becauſe this Paſſage does plainly evince, that *De Laune*'s Maxim is as contrary to Reaſon and the intent of Laws, it is to the practice of the Diſſenters themſelves. But,

Thirdly, Let us inquire whether this Maxim will any better agree with what we find in point of Fact, recorded in our only Rule of Faith the Scriptures: But before we inſtance in particular Caſes, let us for Argument ſake ſuppoſe, what *De Laune* takes for granted, that nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God, unleſs it be in the affirmative expreſſly commanded; if then nothing be lawful in that Caſe, then there is no difference between a thing not expreſſly forbidden; and a thing not expreſſly commanded: For the former is a Sin, why? Becauſe God

God hath expreſſly forbid it: The latter is ſo, (if *De Laune* ſay true,) why? Becauſe it is not expreſſly commanded: But how contrary this is to what we find recorded in our only Rule of Faith, will ſoon appear. For,

Firſt, We read [e] that *Jeroboam* made a Feaſt on the fifteenth Day of the eighth Month; which as I ſhall hereafter ſhew was forbid [f]. *Ahaſuerus* and *Eſther*, they likewiſe appoint a Feaſt-day to be obſerv'd by the *Jews* [g], which God had no where expreſſly commanded: Were they then both ſinful alike? No; for the latter is approv'd [h], the former condemn'd [i].

Again, when *Judas Maccabeus* and his Brethren, had repaired the Temple and new built the Altar, which had then for ſome time been laid waſte; on the fifteenth Day of the ninth Month they dedicated it, and kept that Feaſt eight Days, and appointed the Obſervation of it to Poſterity as a yearly Feſtival [k]. Now, ſince God had no where expreſſly commanded this Obſervation; was it as criminal as *Jeroboam*'s Feaſt of the eighth Month? No, for we find the former approv'd [l], the latter condemn'd [m].

Again, *Jeroboam* built an Altar at *Bethel* [n]: The Children of *Reuben*, *Gad* and others, they alſo built one on the Borders of *Jordan* [o], which God had no where commanded: Were they then both ſinful alike? No, for the latter was approv'd [p], the former was condemn'd [q].

---

[e] 1 *Kings* xii. 22. [f] *Levit.* xxiii. 34, 39, 41. compar'd with *Deut.* xxii. 13. [g] *Eſth.* ix. [h] *Eſth.* ix. 27, 28. [i] 1 *Kings* xii. 33. [k] 1 *Maccab.* iv. 59. [l] *John* x. 22. [m] *Kings* xii. 33. [n] 1 *Kings* xii. 33. [o] *Joſh.* xxii. 10. [p] *Joſh.* xxii. 30, 31. [q] 1 *Kings* xiii. 1, 2, 3.

So

So again, the ſacrificing in Gardens [r], and in Hills and Groves [s], were Places forbidden; and the Synagogues were places of Worſhip uncommanded; were they then both ſinful alike? No, for the latter were approv'd [t], but the former was condemn'd [u].

But farther, if nothing be lawful in the Worſhip of God, but what is in the affirmative expreſſly commanded, what may we think of the Feaſts of Love? (allow'd by all to be in uſe in the firſt and pureſt chriſtian Churches) were they from Heaven or of Men? If from Heaven, why do not the Diſſenters now uſe them? If they were of Men and yet then approved, how does this agree with *De Laune*'s Maxim, that nothing may be done, unleſs it be in the affirmative expreſſly commanded?

So again, what ſhall we think of the holy Kiſs, ſo many times mentioned in the New Teſtament [w]? Likewiſe the anointing of the Sick with Oil [x], were thoſe Cuſtoms from Heaven or of Men? If the former, why then do not the Diſſenters uſe them? if the latter, and yet approved, how does it agree with *De Laune*'s Maxim, that nothing may be done in the Worſhip of God, unleſs it be in the affirmative expreſſly commanded?

And let me here ask what they think of the circumciſing of *Timotheus* [y], had *Paul* an expreſs Command from God for it, or had he not? If he had, I wiſh ſome of them, (the Diſſenters) would be ſo kind as to inform me where I ſhall

---

[r] *Iſai.* lxv. 3. [s] 1 *Kings* xiv. 23. [t] *Acts* xv. 21. [u] 2 *Kings* xvii. 10. [w] 1 *Theſ.* v. 23. *Rom.* xvi. 16. 1 *Cor.* xvi. 16. 2 *Cor.* xiii. 12. 1 *Pet.* v. 14. [x] *Jam.* v. 14. [y] *Acts* xvi. 3.

find

find that Command, and how it came to pass that that Command was not as well binding in the case of *Titus*[z]; but, if he had not an express Command to circumcise him, and yet did it: either *Paul*'s Practice or *De Laune*'s Maxim is to be blamed, which of them it is judge ye.

And once more let me ask them, what they think of *Paul*'s purifying of himself according to the Custom of the *Mosaick* Law[a]? had he an express Command from God for it, or had he not? If he had, how comes it about that we find him so vehemently preaching against those things at *Antioch* and *Corinth*, and other Churches where he had preached the Gospel of Christ? If he had not an express Command for it, and yet did it by the advice of the Council at *Jerusalem*; either the Council was to blame for advising him to do it; or *De Laune* was so, for advancing this Maxim directly contrary thereto. We see then, whither this Maxim will lead Men if it be closely followed, it makes them run counter to Scripture and Reason, as well as the practice of the Dissenters themselves. This (it must be confess'd) is much; but yet this is not all. For,

Fourthly, This Maxim rises up in Judgment against all the well regulated Churches that ever were or ever will be in the World. "For as Dr. *Stil-* "*lingfleet* observes, [b] he must be a great Stranger "to Antiquity, that takes not notice of the great "diversity of Rites and Customs used in (the an-"cient) particular Churches, without any cen-"suring those who differed from them; or if "any by inconsiderate Zeal did proceed so far,

---

[z] *Galat.* ii. 3. [a] *Acts* xxi. 26. [b] *Iren.* pag. 65.

" how ill it was resented by other Churches. " As *Victor*'s excommunicating the *Quarto-de-* " *cimani*, for which he is so sharply reprov'd " by *Irenæus*, who tells him, that the primi- " tive Christians who differed in such things, " did not use to abstain from one another's Com- " munion for them. A most excellent Temper! and I would to God our dissenting Brethren would be of this Mind! Nay, *Socrates* tells us, " [c] That to pen in Paper the infinite and divers " Ceremonies and Customs through Cities and " Countries, would be a very tedious piece of " Work, and scarce, nay, impossible to be done, " says he; but notwithstanding this great variety " of Ceremonies and Customs used among them; " the same Author says, that all those Countries, " Nations, *&c.* thus varied one from another; " yet they never divided the Communion of the " Church, says he, nor brake asunder the Bond " of Unity. And farther in the same Chapter, " he says, that every particular Church had sun- " dry and divers Rites and Ceremonies, yet this " did not make them conceive any worse of " them, than they did of themselves. From all which (and much more that might be produced to the same purpose, if need were) it appears, that there was great variety of uncommanded Rites and Ceremonies used in the primitive Church. And truly I think he may be counted a great Stranger to the present State of the christian Church; that does not know, what great va- riety of Rites and Ceremonies is now used there- in. I shall not stand to give particular Instances

[c] Lib. 5. Chap. 21.

of this, but direct my Reader to *Rosse*'s View of Religion for Satisfaction.

From the Premisses then, I think I may safely conclude, that there never was, nor now is, or ever will be any Church, that has not, does not, or must not use, some uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worship of God: And of Consequence *De Laune*'s Maxim condemns all their Practice; and their Practice, his Principle; which is to be blam'd, let the World judge. And now give me leave to observe to Mr. *De Foe*, and his Brethren of the dissenting Party; that I have according to their Champions (*De Laune*'s) Request, kept him Company through the second Particular I proposed to inquire into: In which Particular (as *De Laune* himself acknowledges) the Merits of the Cause does consist, it being the single point, as he says, on which the whole Controversy does depend, *viz.* that nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, unless it be in the affirmative expressly commanded: Which Maxim does (upon Examination) appear to be in the first Place contrary to the known Practice of the Dissenters themselves: Secondly, to Reason, and the Intent of Laws: Thirdly, to what (in point of Fact) we find recorded in Scripture. And Fourthly, to the Practice of the Church in all Ages, and therefore in my Opinion is false and groundless.

Therefore to use *De Laune*'s own Words; "What shall we say? when so great, so wise, and "so learned a Man as he, does so far forget him- "self, as to make head and run counter to the "Dissenters own Practice, to Reason, to Script- "ture, and the Practice of the christian Church "in all Ages; and then put the Issue of his Cause

"on

" on ſo weak, ſo groundleſs, and in ſhort, ſo " falſe an Argument; which indeed is very " ſtrange and wonderful.

Here then our Author has run himſelf a ground, and woe to him that in ſuch a Caſe is alone; for when he falls, there is none to help him up: But by good Fortune our Author has a Friend at hand, who, if he cannot help him up; yet will do what he can to help him out: I mean the *Animadverter* on Dr. *Calamy*'s Sermon, who tells us [d], he knows of none that think nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God but what himſelf has appointed: But ſure that Gentleman, (whoever he was) took upon him to advocate for a ſort of People, he was not well acquainted with.

For pray tell me, is it not the Cardinal Queſtion put to us by the Diſſenters (and indeed we may with as much Truth and Reaſon ask them the ſame Queſtion) where have you a Command from God for the uſe of this or the other Ceremony? Shew us a Command of God for it, or we will by no means allow it to be lawful! This, I ſay, is the common and the chief Queſtion put to us by them, and yet this Gentleman knows nothing of it, he ſays; but whether he does or not, ſure I am, *De Laune* is as expreſs to the matter as any Man can be; and I am ſure, he is not the only one that has ſaid ſo.

Nay, this Gentleman himſelf immediately adds, " There are indeed ſome (a few I ſuppoſe he " would have us think) that ſay, nothing is law- " ful in the Worſhip of God which himſelf hath " not appointed; which is idle, and ſuperfluous, " and not neceſſary to the Performance of it,

[d] *Animadverſions on Dr.* Calamy's *Sermon*, p. 21.

" upon

" upon the account of Nature, Conveniency, " or apparent Decency. A very pretty Expoſition indeed! *De Laune* and others of the Diſſenters ſay, that nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of of God, but what himſelf has commanded; this our *Animadverter* ſays he knows nothing of; but he immediately recollects himſelf and ſays, there are indeed a few that ſay ſo: So then according to him, there are a few and none at all; and none at all and a few who ſay nothing may be done in the Worſhip of God, which himſelf hath not commanded, which is idle, and not neceſſary to the performance of it, *&c.* I thank him for this learned Diſtinction however; for by it we gain theſe two things. Firſt, That whatever is us'd in the Worſhip of God, in order to that End, is lawful, tho' the things thus us'd be not commanded by him: Nay, tho' they have been abus'd to idolatrous Purpoſes. Secondly, That whatever Ceremonies or Cuſtoms are us'd among the Diſſenters, are us'd with an opinion of Neceſſity in order to that End.

But with ſubmiſſion to his penetrating Judgment, give me leave to ask, how does he make it appear that the Cuſtoms now us'd among them (the Diſſenters) do more naturally ſerve that End than thoſe now us'd by us? Is there an apparent Neceſſity to ſit at the receiving of the Sacrament? when kneeling, ſtanding, or leaning is as apparently decent. Can there be any Neceſſity to uſe leaven'd Bread at that Sacrament? when it's certain unleaven'd does as well (if not better) anſwer the End for which it was inſtituted. Can there be any Neceſſity to receive this Sacrament in the Evening? when 'tis certain it may to all intents and purpoſes be as well done at

Noon, or in the Morning, or at Midnight. And in a word, can there be any Neceſſity to addreſs our ſelves to God in an extemporary Prayer? when it's certain we may as faithfully, and devoutly, and conſequently as acceptably, do it in a Form. If then thoſe things may be as well done by uſing different Ceremonies, then there can be no Neceſſity for the uſe of thoſe now in uſe among the Diſſenters; but the former is true, *ergo* the latter.

If then the Cuſtoms now us'd among them be not neceſſary to the beforeſaid End; how will he be able to make it out that they are lawful? Since it's a known Rule among Divines, as he obſerves [e], that of things merely inexpedient, ſo far forth as they are ſo, they are not lawful. But it ſeems this Rule holds good in every bodies Caſe but their own! however, ſince my deſign is not to expoſe the Performance of this *Animadverter*, I ſhall leave him and his Brethren to conſult on the matter; and if they can hit on't, to render me one good Reaſon, why kneeling is not as decent a Geſture for Prayer, or the receiving of the Sacrament, as ſitting or ſtanding? Let them tell me, what Neceſſity there can be to uſe an Extemporary Prayer, when we addreſs our ſelves to God in publick, if he be as ready and willing to hear and anſwer the hearty, humble, faithful, and devout Prayers of his People, tho' they be offer'd up unto him in a *form of words?* Leaving him, I ſay, and his Brethren to make out this againſt the next time, I ſhall now return to their Champion *De Laune*, and according to my propos'd method inquire,

---

[e] *Pag.* 25.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Upon what account the Church of *England* does appoint the use of some indifferent Ceremonies in the publick Worship of God.

Now in order to do this with the better Success, I think it the best way to set down the Reasons for it in the words of the Church; for why should it be thought another Man knows my mind better than I do my self? Taking it therefore for granted, that she is the best judge of her own Intentions, (tho' in disputes of right and wrong, its unreasonable to allow a Man to be both Judge and Party) let us hear what she says to the matter in hand.

First then, with respect to Articles of Faith, she makes nothing necessary as such, but only what may be read in, or prov'd by the holy Scriptures [f]. And then, Secondly, with respect to the Ceremonies of Worship, she as expressly declares, "[g] That it's not necessary that Traditions and "Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly "like; for at all times they have been divers, "and may be chang'd according to the diversity "of Countries, Times, and Mens Manners, so "that nothing be ordain'd against God's Word. And she farther says, "That every particular or "National Church, hath Authority to change "and abolish, as well as ordain, Ceremonies or "Rites of the Church, ordain'd only by Man's "Authority, so that all things be done to edi-"fying. And farther, we are told in the Preface to the Common Prayer, "That the particu-"lar Forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites "and Ceremonies us'd therein, being things in

[f] *See the sixth Article of the Church of* England.
[g] *Article* 34.

" their own nature indifferent, and alterable at " pleaſure, and being ſo acknowledg'd, 'tis but " reaſonable, that upon weighty and important " Conſiderations, according to the various exi- " gencies of Times and Occaſions, ſuch changes " and alterations ſhould be made therein, as to " thoſe that are in place of Authority ſhall from " time to time ſeem either neceſſary or expedient. From which it plainly appears, that the Ceremonies now us'd in the *Church* of *England*, are not us'd with an opinion of *neceſſity*, but for the ſake of *order*, that both Decency and Peace may be preſerv'd in the Church. And as this is the opinion of the Mother, (the Church of *England)* ſo is it alſo of the Sons of that Church: For *De Laune* himſelf tells us, [h] That Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Moor*, Dr. *Calamy*, Mr. *Allen*, the *Proteſtant Reconciler*, King *James*, and King *Charles*, &c. have all declar'd the Ceremonies of the Church to be things in their own nature *indifferent*, and alterable at pleaſure, and conſequently not neceſſary, as *De Laune* affirms. If then we can (and I think we can do no leſs) ſuppoſe, that the Biſhops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, and the Kings of *England* in Communion with her, know the Church's mind in the preſent caſe better than *De Laune*, then the Ceremonies now us'd therein, are us'd with an opinion of *freedom*, not of *neceſſity*.

But let them ſay, and the Church declare what ſhe will, yet it ſeems ſhe muſt be what *De Laune* (in great wiſdom) is pleas'd to call her; and the Kings, Biſhops, and Doctors, *&c.* that ſay any thing in contradiction to him (how true ſoever it

[h] *Plea*, pag. 11.

is)

is) are all Lyars and Cheats with him: For having told us that the beforesaid Kings, Bishops, and Doctors, have all declar'd the Ceremonies of the Church of *England* things in their own nature indifferent; he immediately adds, [i] "This we are "told in words and pretences the better to gild "the Pill, to make it go down the glibber; but "if you look more narrowly into the matter, "you will find, that you your selves, as well as "the Dissenters, have justly another sense of "them; and that the Church of *England* (what-"ever she says to the contrary) does both use and "impose them as necessary things, whatever they "import in their own Nature. Base Men indeed! what the Kings, the Bishops, and Doctors, *&c.* those who by their Office and Calling, should be lovers of truth, and haters of every false way, are they the Men that premeditate ways to lead us into Sin and Error? This is an unpardonable Crime!

But suppose a bold conceited and wicked Fellow, that had cast off all shame, and therefore was one who neither fear'd God, or reverenc'd Man; suppose, I say, such a Fellow should with as much Impudence (as *De Laune* has done in the before mention'd case) tell me, that the Presbyterians, Independents, *&c.* did all believe (for instance) the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, or any other Opinion which they publickly disown; might I not justly call him a scandalous, impudent, and wicked Fellow? Without doubt I might justly do it! Why then may I not say the same thing of *De Laune?*

[i] *Plea*, pag. 12.

Is it fit to say to a King thou art wicked, says *Job*, [k] *and to Princes, ye are ungodly?* So say I, is it fit to spread false and scandalous Reports, and speak evil of Dignities without a cause? Or is it not rather fit that those that do so be punish'd for it? But I'll let this pass.

Suppose then for Argument sake, that the Church of *England* does not use or impose her Ceremonies as necessary things; what think they of them in that case? Are they then lawful, or are they not? If they are, why do they then condemn the use of lawful things? If they are not in that case lawful; then no uncommanded Ceremonies can be lawful in any case! then let them justify their own practice if they can.

But farther, give me leave to ask this Question, to which if the Dissenters can give a fair answer, it will, in my opinion, decide the Dispute betwixt us: By what Authority do they use some uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worship of God? Is it because God has commanded them so to do? If so, let them produce that Command; and if it will not as well justify the practice of the Church of *England*, as it does the Dissenters, I'll yield the Cause. Is it because there is a Necessity for them to use those Ceremonies rather than others of the like indifferent nature? if so, then they make it necessary to do something in God's Worship, which himself hath not commanded; and therefore themselves are the superstitious Men. Or, Thirdly, is it because the Customs thus us'd by them, do better serve the Ends of Order, Decency, and Peace of the Church? This I have before shewn to be false, and now desire them,

[k] *Job* xxxiv. 18.

if

if they can, to make out by any one ſolid Argument. If then they can uſe ſome uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God without blame, why may not we?

But to give their Argument all the Advantage they can in reaſon deſire; ſuppoſe (not granting) it really were as they ſay; and that the Cuſtoms now us'd among them (the Diſſenters) did ſomewhat better anſwer the beforeſaid end, than thoſe now us'd among us; yet they muſt remember, it is not fit that every private Man ſhould take upon him to ſeparate from, or to reform the things that are (it may be only in his opinion) amiſs in the Church; but rather to ſubmit his Judgment, at leaſt to determine his Practice, by the Cuſtoms of the Church in which he lives; and keeping his particular Opinion to himſelf, (at leaſt not impoſing it on others) peaceably conform himſelf thereto, and patiently wait till God ſhall afford a favourable opportunity of having thoſe things, ſuppos'd to be amiſs, reform'd, in a peaceable, legal, and friendly way.

For I hold this as a ſure Rule, when a diſpute happens about the Eſſentials of Religion, and I cannot enjoy both Truth and Peace; in this caſe I hold it as a ſure Rule, I ſay, to prefer Purity before Peace: But if the Diſpute be about Rituals (things which God has left undetermin'd in his Word) and I cannot have Peace, and at the ſame time practiſe according to my own private Opinion; in this caſe Peace is to be prefer'd before Opinion: If this be not granted, then farewel, not only the Peace of the Church, but the Order too; if it be granted, then I leave them to draw the Conſequence. I ſay then with

St. *Paul*, [l] haſt thou in this caſe Faith? Have it to thy ſelf before God. Trouble not the Church with thy private Opinion; but if thou wilt ſtill be contentious, I anſwer with the ſame St. *Paul*, [m] we have no ſuch Cuſtom, neither the Churches of God.

However, to gratify the requeſt of a certain Friend ſtill of the Diſſenting Party, I ſhall in this place give an Anſwer to that Objection, which, as he ſays, has been ſeveral times made to, but has never yet been ſatisfactorily anſwer'd by us; tho' by the way this is his great miſtake. However, the Objection is as follows.

If, ſay they, the Ceremonies now in uſe in the Church of *England*, be (as you ſay) things in their own nature indifferent; why then are they not left as indifferent in reſpect of Uſe, as they are in Nature? Why ſhould any Man bind us to the obſervation of what God has left free?

Now in anſwering of this (as it ſeems to ſome) difficult Queſtion; I will ſo order the matter, as to make the Objecter both Judge and Party in this Cauſe, and oblige him to give up his Queſtion, or condemn the Diſſenters own Practice.

Suppoſe then I ſhould again come back and join with the Diſſenters; muſt I not then be obliged to uſe ſome uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God, which he has no where obliged me to? Let me then ask them the ſame Queſtion? Since God hath left me free, why ſhould they oblige me to receive the Sacrament ſitting? Or in the Evening, or with leavened Bread, *&c.* Why ſhould I be obliged by them (ſince God has left it free) to uſe an extempo-

[l] *Rom.* xiv. 22. [m] 1 *Cor.* xi. 16.

rary

rary Prayer? And in ſhort, why ſhould I be obliged by them to uſe many uncommanded Ceremonies or Circumſtances of Worſhip, which God has no more commanded, than thoſe now uſed among us? Let them give me an Anſwer to this, and there is no doubt but they will ſoon find an Anſwer to that. And though (I muſt confeſs) asking one Queſtion does not directly anſwer another; yet as our Caſe now ſtands, it will oblige the Objecter to quit either his Opinion or his Practice.

If then they will not join with us, becauſe we impoſe, and for the ſake of Decency and Order, uſe ſome uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God, which he has not commanded: Why ſhould not I for the ſame Reaſon refuſe to join with them? Why do they not look about and obſerve, how juſtly they are condemned by St. *Paul* [n] for condemning others, and at the ſame time practiſing the ſame things themſelves, for which they condemn us?

But *De Laune* farther objects and ſays, "[o] That "things conſecrated and dedicated to holy Uſes, "in the Worſhip of God, ceaſe to be indiffe- "rent, *&c.*

I anſwer, it does ſo, though not in the Senſe he intends in the Objection. For it's plain the words Conſecrated and Dedicated, import no more (at leaſt in this Objection) than to ſet a thing apart, or appoint it to an holy Uſe: Now, when any thing of an indifferent Nature is thus ſet apart or appointed to be uſed in the Worſhip and Service of God, they then ceaſe to be in-

---

[n] *Rom* ii. 1. [o] *Plea*, pag. 12.

different,

different, says he: That is in plain *English*, they cease to be lawful.

But they must remember, saying does not pass for proving among Men that disown an infallible Judge: No, the Proof it seems comes after; but when may we expect it? Alas, as to hope without a Promise is Presumption; so to expect things impossible is foolish.

But for Argument sake, suppose the Dissenters and we should (in point of Ceremonies) change sides: And (to say nothing of their Practice in that Case) suppose the Church of *England* instead of the Common Prayer, that is to say, instead of a Form, should use an extemporary Prayer: Instead of kneeling, should sit at the time of receiving the Blessed Sacrament, *&c.* Let me ask, what think they? Would it be unlawful for us in this Case to comply with, and practise according to the Determinations of the Church, or would it not? If in that Case it would be unlawful for us: Let them tell me then if they can, why it is not now (in the same Case) as unlawful for them? But, if on the contrary it would in the before mentioned Case be lawful for us: Then consequently to appoint the use of some indifferent things in the Worship of God, does not alter the Nature of the thing so appointed; it does not make them cease to be indifferent as *De Laune* affirms: But the former is true, *ergo* the latter. But perhaps a Scripture Example or two may be more taking with them. Therefore,

In the Book of *Esther* [P] we have an account, not only of the *Jews* intended Ruin by, but also

---

[P] *Esth.* ix.

of

of their wonderful Deliverance from the Conſpiracy of wicked *Haman:* In Memory of which Deliverance, they of their own Accord kept Feſtival the fourteenth and fifteenth Days of the Month *Adar:* Which Feaſt (though at firſt a voluntary Undertaking) was afterwards by the Edict of the King made perpetually obligatory to them and their Poſterity: Here then we ſee thoſe *Jews* bound by humane Law, to the Obſervation of a Cuſtom in it's own Nature indifferent: Though by them at firſt, and by the King at laſt intended to a Religious End and Purpoſe: Now, what did the *Jews* do in this Caſe? Did they tell the King (what our Diſſenting Brethren in effect tell their lawful Superiors) if you leave us to our own Choice, whether we will obſerve this Feaſt or not; we'll ſay it's lawful to obſerve it; and (it being a thing in it's own Nature indifferent, and left ſo to us) perhaps we may ſome time or other when we pleaſe make uſe of it: But if you make a Law to bind us to the Obſervation of this Cuſtom; be it known to thee, O King, it alters the Caſe, (this Cuſtom now ceaſes to be indifferent) and we will not obey? Did thoſe *Jews* ſay any thing like this? Not a Word, but directly the contrary! For the Text tells us they took upon them, and upon their Seed, and upon all that joyned themſelves unto them, ſo that it ſhould not fail, that they would keep thoſe two Days, according to the Writing (of the King) and according to the time every Year. Now this they could not have lawfully done, had they known any thing of this Maxim of *De Launé*'s. The ſame thing may be obſerved with reſpect to the Feaſt of Dedication, at firſt inſtituted by *Judas*

das Maccabeus [q], but countenanc'd by our Saviour himself [r]. The like Observation might be made on the Determinations of the Council at *Jerusalem* [f], if compared with what St. *Paul* writes to the *Romans* [t], and *Corinthians* [u]; one did not bind at *Antioch*; the other did not bind at *Rome* or *Corinth*; and consequently neither of them were standing Laws for all Christian Churches to walk by; but were positive and prudent, but yet temporary Injunctions binding those, and only those, and yet not always those to whom they were at first made. I conclude then, he that lays an Obligation on me to abstain from the use of any thing, which neither God nor the Church has forbid; does as effectually rob me of my Liberty as he, that obliges me to do any thing, which neither God nor the Church has appointed. Nay, if I am obliged to preserve my Christian Liberty in the use of things indifferent; and if I cannot do this, but by contradicting in practice what my lawful Superiors either command or forbid; then pray tell me, why it is not as great a Duty to do what they forbid, as it is to leave undone what they command? Since both he that forbids, and he that commands me to do any thing which God has left free, does equally destroy my Christian Liberty. And this brings to my mind what Bishop *Taylor* has long ago asserted, [w] He says, "It is as great a Sin to "teach for Doctrines the Prohibitions as the "Injunctions and Commandments of Men: To "say we may not do what is lawful, as that it "is necessary to do that which is only permitted or

[q] 1 *Maccab.* iv. 59. [r] *John* x. 22. [f] *Acts* xv. 29. [t] *Rom.* xiv. 14. [u] 1 *Corinth.* viii. 4, 7. Chap. xi. 16. [w] *Duct. Dub.* Lib. 2. Chap. 3. pag. 463.

"com-

" commanded. He that impoſes on Mens Con-
" ſciences an Affirmative or a Negative which
" God has not impoſed, is equally injurious and
" equally ſuperſtitious; and we can no more
" ſerve or pleaſe God in abſtaining from what is
" innocent, than we can by doing what he has
" not commanded. He that thinks he ſerves
" God by looking to the Eaſt when he prays,
" and believes all Men, and at all times obliged
" to do ſo, is a ſuperſtitious Man; but he that
" believes this to be Superſtition, and therefore
" turns from the Eaſt, and believes it alſo ne-
" ceſſary that he do not look that way, is equal-
" ly guilty of the ſame Folly: And is like a
" Traveller that ſo long goes from the Eaſt
" till he comes unto it by long Progreſſion in
" the Circle. If by the Law of God it be not
" ſinful, or if by the Law of God it be not
" neceſſary, no Doctrines of Men can make it
" ſo: To call good evil, or evil good, is equal-
" ly hateful to God; and as every Man is bound
" to preſerve his Liberty, that a yoke be not
" impoſed on his Conſcience, and he be tied to do
" what God has left free; ſo is he obliged
" to take care that he be not hinder'd, but that
" he may ſtill do it if he will. That this no
" way relates to humane Laws I ſhall afterwards
" demonſtrate: I now ſpeak of impoſing on
" Mens Underſtandings, not on their Wills or
" outward Acts. He that ſays, that without a
" Surplice we cannot pray to God acceptably,
" and he that ſays, we cannot well pray with it,
" are both to blame; but if a poſitive Law of our
" Superiors intervenes; that is Conſideration, *&c.*
All which I leave to be conſider'd by the Diſſenters; and let them apply it as they ſee convenient.

But

But *De Laune* goes on, and in the next Place charges us with *adding to the word of God*; with *Will-worſhip*, and with *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, &c. Sure then among ſo much Smoke, there muſt be ſome Fire; where ſo much Dirt is thrown, ſome will ſtick! however let us hear how he makes this out. Why,

Firſt, ſays he, Mr. *Faulkner* (one of our own Pens) ſays, "That Men add to the Word of "God, when they teach any thing to be either "commanded or forbidden by the Law of God; "which is not there commanded or forbidden. Which indeed is very true! But how will they from this Definition, argue the Church of *England* guilty of the thing in Queſtion? Does ſhe teach any thing to be commanded or forbid, which is not commanded or forbid by God's Word? Does ſhe not declare to all the World, [x] "That (with "reſpect to Articles of Faith) Holy Scripture "containes all things neceſſary to Salvation: So "that whatſoever is not read therein, or may be "proved thereby, is not to be required of any "Man, that it ſhould be believed as an Arti-"cle of Faith. So then ſhe is in this reſpect free from blame: And then with reſpect to Ceremonies of Worſhip, ſhe as expreſſly declares [y], "That "it is not neceſſary that Traditions and Cere-"monies be in all Place one, or utterly like; "for at all Times they have been divers, and "may be changed, according to the diverſity of "Countries, Times, and Mens Manners, ſo that "nothing be ordained againſt God's Word. And farther ſays, "That every national Church, hath "Authority to ordain, change and aboliſh Ce-

[x] *Article* 6. [y] *Article* 34.

"remonies

" remonies or Rites of the Church, ordained " only by Man's Authority, so that all things " be done to edifying. If then adding to the Word of God, does consist in teaching that to be either unlawful or necessary which God's Word does not make so: And if the Church of *England* (as appears from her Articles) does not teach any thing to be either unlawful or necessary, which God's Word does not make so: Then it will of Consequence follow, that the Church of *England* is not guilty of adding to the Word of God, according to Mr. *Faulkner*'s Definition of it: But the former is true, *ergo* the latter.

But suppose, he that has been so zealously imployed to find his Neighbour guilty, should at last be found so himself? and for my part I know not how he can be excused! For let me put the Question, when may a Man be said to add to the Word of God? And now let Mr. *Faulkner* answer, and he says, when he teaches any thing to be commanded or forbid (mind that) by the Word of God, which indeed is not thereby either commanded or forbid. Has not *De Laune* done this? Does not he reject as unlawful the use of Holydays, Fasts, Feasts, Liturgies, *&c.* therefore unless the Prohibition be produced that makes them so: Let them take their Affliction patiently; for it cannot be evaded, their Champion stands condemned of adding to the Word of God; by the approved Definition given of it by Mr. *Faulkner*. But,

Secondly, Bishop *Sanderson* (another of our own Pens) says, " Men teach for Doctrines the " Commandments of Men, when they teach a- " ny thing to be absolutely unlawful, which " God has not forbid in his Word; (pray mind " that)

" that) and if any Man ſhall wear a Surplice, " or kneel, or croſs, with an opinion of Ne- " ceſſity, and for Conſcience ſake towards God, " as though his Worſhip and Service could not " be rightly performed without them; yea, al- " though the Church had not enjoyn'd them, " doubtleſs the uſe of theſe Ceremonies, by rea- " ſon of ſuch his Opinion, ſhould be Superſti- " tion to him: Which Paſſage, *De Laune* would willingly have his Reader believe, is to none more applicable than to the Church of *England*. But alas, this Paſſage is ill produced, if deſigned by him, to prove the Church of *England* guilty of teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

For, what though it be Superſtition (in the Opinion of the Biſhop) to croſs or kneel, *&c.* with an Opinion of Neceſſity, and for Conſcience ſake towards God, as though his Worſhip could not be rightly performed without them: Yea, though the Church had not enjoyned them, *&c.* yet ſince as hath been ſhewn, the Church does not ſo appoint the uſe of croſſing, kneeling, *&c.* they will for ever be to ſeek for the *Minor*, and conſequently can never draw any ſuch Concluſion againſt her. For, according to the Opinion of Biſhop *Sanderſon*, the Argument ſtands thus; whoever wears a Surplice, or kneels, or croſſes, with an Opinion of Neceſſity, and for Conſcience ſake towards God, as though God's Service could not be rightly performed without them; yea though the Church had not enjoyned them; he doubtleſs is a ſuperſtitious Man: But the Church of *England* (as is before ſhewn) does not ſo appoint; nor the Members of that Church uſe the before-ſaid Cere-

Ceremonies with any such superstitious Opinion: *Ergo*, What? When they are at leisure let them tell me: Nay, but in the mean time they will do well to quit themselves from blame, if Bishop *Sanderson*'s Definition of teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men be good, as *De Laune* says, it is very good. For,

When may a Man in his Opinion be truly said to teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men? Why, when he teaches any thing to be *absolutely unlawful*, which God has not forbid in his Word: But *De Laune* and others of the Dissenters, reject as absolutely unlawful the use of many things which God has no where forbid in his Word: Therefore if Bishop *Sanderson* say true, those are the Men that teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

And here again give me leave to observe, how very unfair *De Laune*'s way of proceeding is; when ever he is minded to lay any scandalous Reflection on the Church of *England*, he puts on a demure Look, and (perhaps with a design to deceive his Reader) ushers in the Scandal with the Church of *England*'s *own Pens*. One while Dr. *Stillingfleet* pawns the Church's Cause, and (in his Opinion) turns Advocate for the Dissenters: At another time it seems, Mr. *Faulkner*'s Pen is employed, to prove the Church guilty of adding to the Word of God: If this will not do, then in comes Bishop *Sanderson*'s Authority, to prove her guilty of teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men: But if this should also fail him, he has prudently reserved a Friend or two behind, that in his Opinion never fail, and with them he pins the Basket; namely Dr. *Patrick*, and the *Protestant Reconciler*: Both which

it seems join hand in hand to prove the Church of *England* guilty of Will-worship: Nay, in this point, they so fully speak the sense of the Dissenters, that there needs no better Answer to be given, says he [z], than what they (Dr. *Patrick*, &c.) have put into their (the Dissenters) Mouths.

However, since in this, as well as in other Particulars, I find *De Laune* a very unfair Man in citing Authors, I shall in this place transcribe the whole Passage refer'd to by him in Dr. *Patrick's Friendly Debate*; that so I may at once acquit the Church of *England* of his (*De Laune*'s) Charge; shew his mistake, and make the World sensible how much his Word is to be depended on. You must know then, this *Friendly Debate* is writ by way of Response, betwixt a Clergy Man of the Church of *England*, and a Dissenter either real or personated; which Dissenter tells the Clergy Man, [a] "That he had heard some of them, "the Dissenters, call the Church of *England*'s "Form of Service Will-worship, which the A-"postle condemns *Col.* ii. and the last.

Unto which the Clergy Man (who for distinction sake is call'd *C*) replies, "Very like they might, "and not understand what they said.

"Do you believe, says *NC*, (the Dissenter) "that they would, like brute Beasts, speak evil "of things they know not?

"*C.* I will not censure them of that, but this "I can tell you, that one of your Ministers con-"fess'd to a sober Person of my acquaintance, "that he had never so much as read over the "Common Prayer Book in all his Life; and yet

---

[z] Delaune's *Plea*, p. 14.

[a] Friendly Debate, *p.* 113.

"he

" he was no youngſter. Perhaps there may be
" more ſuch; and then if they ſpeak againſt it,
" judge of them as you ſee cauſe.

" *N C.* I believe ſuch Men diſlike it without
" looking into it; becauſe, as I told you, it is
" Will-worſhip, a mere invention of Men.

" *C.* That's a word of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*,
" whom no doubt they have read, but I queſtion
" whether they underſtood him.

" *N C.* Why ſhould you doubt it?

" *C.* Becauſe if we take the ſenſe of the words
" not from Fancy, but from the Matter where-
" with it's connected, it makes nothing for, but
" much againſt your purpoſe.

" *N C.* Can you tell better than they?

" *C.* I do not ſay ſo, but I have heard one of
" our Miniſters give ſuch an Explication of the
" place, as ſatisfy'd me that you uſe a Weapon
" that wounds your ſelves.

" *N C.* Let's hear it.

" *C.* If you look a little back, you will find the
" Apoſtle forbids worſhipping of Angels, *(ver.* 18.)
" as a bold invention of Men, for which there
" was no Revelation. And then he ſpeaks againſt
" ſuch ſuperſtitious People (whether *Jews* or o-
" thers he could not tell us) as made it unlaw-
" ful to marry, to eat ſome kind of Meats, to
" touch or come near ſome Things; none of
" which God had made ſinful, but they were
" the mere commandments of Men; *(ver.* 21,
" 22.) now thoſe that were of this humour, he
" immediately after *(ver.* 23.) charges with *Will-*
" *worſhip*; which muſt therefore, one would
" think, conſiſt in theſe two things.

" Firſt, In giving the Worſhip due to God to
" ſome Creature or other. Secondly, In enjoyn-

" ing that as a thing neceſſary, and commanded " of God as a piece of his Worſhip and Service, " which he has left indifferent; or in other " words (of which *De Laune* cites a part) when " any thing is enjoyn'd to be either done or not " done (pray mind that) as if it were the Will " and Command of God he ſhould be ſo ſerv'd, " when it is a mere conſtitution of the Will of " Man, then a Will-worſhip is erected. Here *De Laune* breaks off, and it was well he did, for had he gone on he had diſcover'd the ſecret: However, tho' he will not go on, his Author does; " and now, ſays he, I am ſure you will " not make us guilty of the firſt ſort of Will-" worſhip, becauſe none are more againſt it than " we. And as for the ſecond, our Church has " declar'd to all the World, that none of the " things you boggle at are impos'd under the " notion of *Neceſſity*, or religious in themſelves, " or as commanded of God; but are of an *in-*" *different* Nature, and only us'd as *decent* and " *comely* in the judgment of the preſent Gover-" nors, who can alter theſe things, and conſti-" tute ſomething elſe in the room, if they ſee it " fit; which they could not pretend to, did they " think them *neceſſary*. But then, as our Church " is not guilty of Will-worſhip in the Apoſtles " ſenſe; ſo on the other ſide, I know not how " to excuſe thoſe from that very guilt, who op-" poſe what is ordain'd among us as unlawful, " and forbid us to uſe thoſe Rites and Orders, " becauſe ſinful things. For they make that *ne-*" *ceſſary* to be forborn and left undone, which " God has not made ſo, but left *indifferent*; and " ſo they in effect condemn thoſe as Sinners, " whom God acquits from all blame. As thoſe

" in

" in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe ſaid, touch not, taſte " not, handle not; ſo you ſay, kneel not, pray " not by a Form, wear not a Surplice, *&c.* Now " ſince you think (as thoſe Men did) to pleaſe " God by not doing thoſe things which he has " no where forbidden; I do not ſee but you " commit the very fault which the Apoſtle re- " proves; that is, you make that neceſſary not " to be done (if we will be true Worſhippers of " God) which he has not made neceſſary not to " be done, but left us at liberty to do it if we " will. By which means you make a Religion " of your own, and ſtudy to honour God by ab- " ſtaining from thoſe things, by which he never " ſaid he was diſhonour'd. O that all tender Con- " ſciences would conſider this! for they would " ſoon diſcern that your Miniſters, by forbidding " theſe things now in diſpute, lay greater burdens " upon the Conſciences of their Brethren, and " clog them with more Duties, than God has " laid upon them: Whereas we, who think thoſe " things may be done, lay no more burthen on " the Conſciences, (of our Brethren) than what " God himſelf hath laid; which is to obey our " Governors in all things, wherein he himſelf " has not bidden us to do the contrary. Thus far the Doctor. But why did *De Laune* hide this from his Reader? There was, as I ſaid before, a very good Reaſon for it; for had he gone on, his Reader, in all probability, had ſeen that this Paſſage thus produc'd by him, in order to prove the Church of *England* guilty of Will-worſhip, did effectually condemn him, and prove the Diſ- ſenters, not the Church, guilty of it. How much then are *De Laune*'s Word and Citations to be de- pended on? But I ſhall not inſiſt on this now, be-

cauſe I ſhall have an occaſion to ſpeak more fully to it hereafter.

However, I can do no leſs but in this Place, obſerve how very unfortunate he has been in calling in Church of *England* Divines to aſſiſt in his Cauſe againſt the Church, not one of which gives the leaſt Aſſiſtance to it: But on the contrary, they all in their turns point at him, and ſay; thou, and not the Church of *England* art guilty of adding to the Word of God: Thou, and not the Church of *England*, art guilty of teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men; thou, and not the Church of *England*, art guilty of *Will-worſhip*, as is but now prov'd upon you by Dr. *Patrick*, one of your pretended Witneſſes againſt the Church.

In ſhort, to me it appears very plain, that ſince the Ceremonies of the Church are not impoſed as neceſſary things and commanded by God; but are profeſſedly uſed as things indifferent, and as matters of humane Prudence; they cannot in Juſtice be charged as Acts of Will-worſhip.

But it may be, ſome Body will object to me and ſay, as *De Laune* has done to Mr. *Allen* in the like Caſe [b], that for my better Information, (that they are ſo to be eſteemed when ſo uſed) they will refer me, as he did him, to the *Proteſtant Reconciler*, to clear the ſame with this Addition to *Jeroboam*'s Caſe: Who, as he ſays, varied but in four particular Circumſtantials of Worſhip, and we have done it in above forty, ſays he [c], and ſo it ſeems are ten times worſe than *Jeroboam*, who was wicked even to a Pro-

[b] *Plea*, p. 14. [c] P. 16.

verb!

verb! May we not then in his, read what is our deſerved Puniſhment? But hold a little, if the Caſes are not the ſame, why ſhould the Puniſhment be ſo? therefore before they fix the Puniſhment, let them ſhew that (with reſpect to Ceremonies) *Jeroboam*'s Caſe and ours is the ſame: For if they cannot make out the one we have no reaſon to fear the other.

Well then in order to do this he (*De Laune*) tells us, [d] "That *Jeroboam* (as well as we) kept "to the Fundamentals of Religion, worſhip- "ping with reverence the God of his Fathers, "and made Alterations in (but four) things, (and "they) merely Ceremonial, (as we call our Ce- "remonies) whereof no expreſs Law forbidding, "and being variable, (as we ſay ours are) as Time "and Place, *&c.* gave occaſion. This is in Sub- "ſtance what he has to ſay for it: And if any ask what I have to ſay againſt it, they ſhall know that hereafter. But firſt give me Liberty to obſerve, when he is ſpeaking of *Jeroboam*'s Offence, he puts very candid Conſtructions on it; he ſays, that he (*Jeroboam*) varied in but four particular Circumſtances of religious Worſhip, and they ſuch as were alterable at pleaſure, being things which God had no were forbid, *&c.* And as for the Fundamentals of Religion, he kept ſtill cloſe to that, and worſhipped with Reverence the God of his Fathers, *&c.* but when he comes to ſpeak of the Service and Ceremonies of the *Church* of *England*; why then he divides and ſub-divides, and again divides, till he has branched it out into almoſt a thouſand Particulars; every one of which (if we may take his

[d] P. 15.

Word for it) is, as it were a Calf of *Jeroboam*'s Cow; every Saint's-day in his Opinion is, as criminal as *Jereboam*'s Feaſt of the eighth Month; our Churches and Chapels as ſo many *Dans* and *Bethels*; and our Clergy no better accounted of by him, than ſo many of *Jeroboam*'s Prieſts: Now what can he intend by all this, think we, but to defame the Church, and make the unthinking Multitude believe, that all thoſe that are Members of it, are ſo many Worſhippers of *Baal*, that of right ought to be deſtroyed by the religious Zeal of theſe *Jehus?* But, what if *Shimei* curſe, will it hurt *David?* Not at all, for the Curſe that is cauſleſs ſhall not come. Let them then go on and like him curſe as they go; nay, but let them rather take *Balaam*'s Honeſty along with them[e], and then how can they curſe that which God has not curſed? Or how can they defy that which God has bleſs'd? *He that juſtifies the Wicked, and he that condemneth the Juſt, even they both are* an *Abomination to the Lord*, ſays *Solomon*[f]: Whether *De Laune* be guilty or not will ſoon appear, if we view the Caſes both of the *Church* of *England* and *Jeroboam*, as they are repreſented by *De Laune* on the one hand, and by the Scripture on the other. But firſt, what ſays *De Laune*, and what ſays the Scripture, with reſpect to *Jeroboam*'s Caſe? Why,

Firſt, *De Laune* ſays[g], "That *Jeroboam* varied from the Pattern given to him in but "four Particulars, as to the Service and Cere"monies of Worſhip, *viz.* Firſt, as to the Place

---

[e] *Numb.* xxiii. 8. [f] *Prov.* xvii. 15. [g] *Plea*, p. 15.

"of

" of Worſhip *(Dan* and *Bethel* inſtead of *Jeru-*
" *ſalem.)* Secondly, in the Signs of the Di-
" vine Preſence, Golden-calves inſtead of Che-
" rubims.) Thirdly, In the time of the Feaſt
" (the fifteenth Day of the eighth Month, in-
" ſtead of the fifteenth Day of the ſeventh
" Month.) Fourthly, In the Perſons admini-
" ſtering (making Prieſts of the loweſt of the
" People that were not of the Sons of *Aaron)*
" all which, ſays he, one would think were but
" Circumſtantials about Worſhip, and impoſed,
" not under the Notion of being commanded
" by God, but only (as Mr. *Allen* obſerves of
" our Ceremonies) as matters of *humane Pru-*
" *dence*, and for which *Jeroboam* had much to
" ſay to the Diſſenters in that Day; as that he
" made no Alterations in the *Subſtantials* of *Re-*
" *ligion*, but kept that pure, and as *De Laune*
" ſays, worſhipped with reverence the God of
" his Fathers, and varied from the Pattern, only
" in four things merely Ceremonial, whereof no
" expreſs Law forbid the doing, and therefore
" might well be comply'd with, ſince they
" were ſuch variable things as might be chang'd
" and altered at Pleaſure according as Time,
" Place, and Perſons gave occaſion.

" But however *Jeroboam* might mince the
" matter, ſays *De Laune*, as others do in the
" like Circumſtances; yet God being a jealous
" God, would not admit of ſuch Innovations
" and Varyings from his pure Worſhip, but re-
" proves theſe for deſperate Idolatry, and re-
" putes them no better than the worſhipping of
" Devils[h]. Thus have I given you the Sum

[h] 2 *Cron.* xi. 15.

and

and Subſtance of *Jeroboam*'s Offence, as the ſame is repreſented by *De Laune*. And truly, according to him it was like *Zoar* a little one; conſiſting in no greater Crime, than the appointing and uſing of four uncommanded Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God: Which as they were not commanded, ſo neither were they forbid; and therefore one would think, ſays he, they were variable at Pleaſure. But if any ſhould be ſo ignorant as to think ſo, they muſt pardon me for telling them, there is great Reaſons to be given why they ſhould think again.

For I take it from granted, that wherever God has commanded any thing, whether it reſpects the *Subſtance* or the *Circumſtance* of his Worſhip, there Man is bound to obey accordingly, unleſs ſome moral or natural Law ſhould intervene; for Laws natural and moral, take place before poſitives; as is plain in the Example of *David*'s eating the Shew-bread in a caſe of Neceſſity, which had not but for that Reaſon been lawful for him to eat; and by our *Saviour*'s permitting a Man to labour on the Sabbath-day, if it be in order to take an Ox or an Aſs out of a Ditch; and though it is expreſſly ſaid, [i] that the uncircumciſed Man-child ſhould be cut off from God's People, yet the *Iſraelites* for forty Years together did not circumciſe them [k]. However, as Poverty muſt not be uſed as an Argument to juſtify Theft, ſo neither muſt Men make Caſes of Neceſſity in points of Religion, where there is none. If God was pleaſed to bind the *Jew*, both with reſpect to the Subſtance and Circum-

[i] *Gen.* xvii. 14. [k] *Joſh.* v. 2——10.

ſtances

ſtances of his Worſhip, no doubt but they ought to obey accordingly: But if he has not bound us ſo, it's plain he has allowed us a greater Liberty.

However, I ſhall not now inſiſt farther on that, becauſe I ſhall have an Occaſion to ſhew it in Particulars hereafter; therefore give me leave to go on, and (according to the Method propoſed) in the next Place, ſee what account the Scripture gives of *Jeroboam*'s Offence.

And here I find him characteriz'd, *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat* that made *Iſrael* to ſin; Firſt, by rebelling againſt *Rehoboam* their lawful King, when he was young and tender hearted and could not withſtand them [l], for which Reaſon (as I take it) they are there call'd vain Men and Children of Belial, that is of the Devil; for he was the firſt, and according to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, is the Father of all Rebels. Nay, it's obſervable, that the Prophet *Hoſea* [m], (ſpeaking of this Revolt) ſays, *Iſrael hath caſt off the thing that is good, the Enemy ſhall purſue him.* But how had they done this? Why, it there follows, Verſe the fourth, *They have ſet up Kings, but not by me: They have made Princes, and I knew it not*, &c. Nay farther, *Jeroboam* himſelf does in effect confeſs the illegality of this Revolt: For ſays he, [n] *Now ſhall the Kingdom return to the Houſe of* David (that is, to *Rehoboam* his lawful Heir) *if this People go up to do Sacrifice in the Houſe of the Lord at* Jeruſalem, *then ſhall the Hearts of this People turn again unto their Lord, even to* Rehoboam *King of*

---

[l] 2 *Chron.* xiii. 7. [m] *Hoſ.* viii. 3. [n] 1 *King.* xii. 26.

Judah;

Judah; *so shall they kill me, and go again to* Rehoboam *King of* Judah. You see then, *Jeroboam* himself acknowledges, that *Rehoboam* was the People's Lord and King; and if so, then was not he a Rebel? But,

Secondly, He made *Israel to sin*, by revolting from God's pure Religion and Worship. And truly I am of Opinion, we shall ever find it true in Experience: *That those who take upon them to turn things upside down in the State; will not much regard the Peace of the Church.* When *Jeroboam* had prevail'd with the People to rebel against their King, and by that means to disquiet the State: How long was it before he set them up Golden-Calves, to worship as the Gods that brought them out of *Egypt*; When the People were once prevailed on to cast off their Allegiance to their King, and to think him a Tool of their making, and subject to the giddy Mob; who (like *Nebuchaduezzar*) have Power to set up and pull down whom they please: When once the People are prevailed on, I say, to believe this; how long is it before they cast off their respect for God's Worship and Priests? Truly not long! I must confess, it passes with me for a prov'd Case, that whoever is an Enemy to Monarchy, is no hearty Friend to Episcopacy: If *Jeroboam*'s Race prevailed, how long will the Tribe of *Levi* stand? There did God's holy Religion never flourish, where his Priests were in Contempt; and contemned they were always where the Successors of *Korah* and *Jeroboam* prevailed. But not to insist farther on this, but to return to the particular Case in hand; with respect to that I shall,

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Obſerve that *Jeroboam* in matters of Religion, went directly contrary to the Command of God.

Firſt, with reſpect to the Place of Worſhip, God appointed *Jeruſalem* for that purpoſe; *Jeroboam* on the contrary appointed *Dan* and *Bethel*. Secondly, he *(Jeroboam)* appointed *Golden-calves* inſtead of *Cherubims*; for the Signs of the divine Preſence. Thirdly, with reſpect to the Time of the Feaſt, God appointed that it ſhould be obſerved on the fifteenth of the ſeventh Month; *Jeroboam* on the contrary appointed it to be done on the fifteenth Day of the eighth Month. Fourthly with reſpect to the Perſons adminiſtring, God had appointed the Sons of *Aaron*, *Jeroboam* on the contrary made Prieſts of the *loweſt of the People*, which were not of the Sons of *Aaron*, *&c.* ſo that in each of thoſe particulars, *Jeroboam* went directly contrary to the expreſs Command of God.

But becauſe *De Laune* pretends from this inſtance of *Jeroboam*'s Caſe, to ſhew that the Church of *England* is chargeable with *Will-worſhip*: I think it may not be amiſs in this Place, to give the four Particulars before mentioned, a more particular Examination.

Firſt then, to begin with the Place in which God's Worſhip was to be performed. We read [n] that when *Moſes* the *Jews* great Deliverer and Law-giver had travailed up and down with them thirty eight Years in the Wilderneſs, they at laſt came to a Valley over againſt *Beth-peor* in the *Amorites* Countrey; at which Place *Moſes* called all *Iſrael* together and ſaid [p], *Hear, O*

---

[o] *Deut.* ii. 14. *compared with* Chap. iv. 46.
[p] *Deut.* v. 1.

Iſrael,

Israel, *the Laws and the Ordinances which I propose to you this Day, that ye may learn them, and take heed to observe them. The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in* Horeb. *The Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers only, but with us, even with us, all here alive this Day*, &c. But the Law here spoken of being purely Moral, and what therefore spake nothing of the Ceremonial or Circumstantial part of God's Worship, he puts them in mind of another Law to be observed by them, when they were got over *Jordan*, and were in Possession of the promised Land. Then says he, [q] *Take heed that ye do all the Commandments and the Laws which I set before you this Day.* And what they were he tells us, so far at least as concerns our present Inquiry, [r] *Take heed to thy self*, says *he, that thou offer not thy Burnt-offering in every Place that thou seest, but in the Place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy Tribes; there thou shalt offer thy Burnt-offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.* From this and many other Texts of Scripture that might be produced, (as *chap.* xvi. 11, 16, *&c.*) it appears that a Place of Worship was to be appointed; and when it was, the *Jews* were commanded to come to that, and forbid to go to any other Place to worship. *For then ye shall not do after all these things that we do this Day, that is every Man whatsoever seemeth him good in his own Eyes* [s], but *to the Place which the Lord shall choose to put his Name there, thither shalt thou come.* Nay, the Scripture admits of no excuse for the omission of this

---

[q] *Deut.* xi. 32. [r] Chap. xii. 13. [s] Chap. xii. 8.

Duty:

Duty: For if they lived a great way off from *Jeruſalem*, yet ſtill they muſt go; they muſt not ſay, as *Jeroboam* did, it's too much for us to go ſo far to worſhip; no, this will not excuſe the matter; for it is expreſſly ſaid [t] *If the Place which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe be far off from thee*, (ſo that they could not conveniently carry an Ox, or a Sheep, *&c.*) *then thou ſhalt turn it into Money, and bind up the Money in thine hand, and ſhalt go unto the Place which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe*, &c. So then, the only thing now wanting proof is, whether God (in the Days of *Jeroboam*) had choſen any ſuch Place, and where it was.

To make out which, let us obſerve, that *Jeroboam* did not make this Revolt till after the Death of *Solomon*; who built the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, unto which the beforeſaid Text of Scripture alludes; as all know, who are but tolerably acquainted with the Scripture; and therefore it would be loſt time to multiply Texts for the proof of it. However, if any ſtill doubt of this, let them read 2 *Chron.* vi. 5, 6. where it is ſaid, *Since the time that I brought my People out of* Egypt, *I choſe no City of all the Tribes of* Iſrael *to build an Houſe in, that my Name might be there; neither choſe I any Man to be a Ruler over my People* Iſrael; *but I have choſen* Jeruſalem, *that my Name might be there, and have choſen* David *to be over my People* Iſrael. So again, [u] *And the Lord appear'd unto* Solomon *by Night, and ſaid unto him, I have heard thy Prayer,* [w] *and have choſen this Place to my ſelf for an Houſe of Sacrifice.* And *ver.* 16. *For now have I choſen and ſanctified this*

---

[t] Chap. xiv. 23, 24, 25, 26. [u] Chap. vii. 12.
[w] Chap. vi. 17, 18, 19. 1 *Kings* viii. 27.

Houſe,

Houſe, that my Name may be there for ever; and mine Eyes, and my Heart, ſhall be there perpetually.

Is not this a ſufficient proof? if not, let the Diſſenters ſhew me a Reaſon why it is not; if it be, then (if they can) let them juſtify *De Laune*'s Application. For, if under the Goſpel Diſpenſation there is no particular Place appointed by God for his Worſhip, as there was then; then the caſes propos'd are not, in this point, parallel; and conſequently, the application made by him, is both unjuſt and unreaſonable. But,

Secondly, *Jeroboam* offended in appointing (and made *Iſrael* to ſin in worſhipping) the *golden Calves*, inſtead of *Cherubims*, for ſigns of the Divine Preſence, which was directly contrary to what *Moſes* had appointed. For when he, that is, *Moſes*, (by the ſpecial direction of Almighty God, *Exod.* xxv.) had given inſtructions to the *Iſraelites* for making the *Ark*, the Mercy Seat, and the *Cherubims*; and having in *ver.* 20, 21. of that Chapter, likewiſe told them how each of them were to be plac'd, *viz.* that the *Mercy Seat ſhould be plac'd on the Ark, and the Cherubims over the Mercy Seat.* He then tells them, *ver.* 22. that *there*, that is, as it there follows, *from above the Mercy Seat, between the two Cherubims, which are over, or upon the Ark of the Teſtimony, I will declare my ſelf unto thee, and there will I tell thee all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the Children of Iſrael.* Read alſo *Chap.* xxx. 9, 36. *Levit.* xvi. 2. and you will no doubt be convinc'd, that it was not an indifferent matter, whether *golden Calves* or *Cherubims*, were appointed as the Signs of the divine Preſence.

Having now taken a View of the Precepts of *Moſes* in relation to this particular, let us in the

next place see, how his and other holy Mens Practice did agree therewith. As for *Moses*, we find that he frequently went into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to speak with God[x]; and that God was graciously pleas'd to answer him from *between the two Cherubims*, according to his Promise. We find the Royal Prophet *David* likewise praying unto God and saying[y], *Hear, O thou Shepherd of* Israel; *thou that leadest* Joseph *like a Sheep*; *shew thy brightness, thou that sittest between the Cherubims.* So again, [z] *The Lord reigneth, let the People tremble; he sitteth between the Cherubims, let the Earth be moved.* Nay farther, God is said not only to sit, but also to *dwell between the Cherubims* [a]; perhaps to teach *Jeroboam* and his Adherents, that it was in vain to seek him at *Dan*, or *Bethel*, or any other place, but that which he had appointed and promis'd to be present at. And so we find the good *Hezekiah* praying unto the Lord and saying, [b] *O Lord God——which dwellest between the Cherubims*, &c. Now if what I have said be (and if it be not, I know not what is) a good proof, that not the *Golden Calves*, but the *Cherubims*, were appointed by God, for the Signs of the divine Presence; then it necessarily follows, it was no indifferent thing, as *De Laune* intimates, whether *Cherubims* or *Golden Calves* were appointed as Signs of the divine Presence. So then I must again say, since in this particular likewise, our Case and *Jeroboam*'s is not parallel, *De Laune*'s Application is both unjust and unreasonable. But,

---

[x] *Numb.* vii. 87. [y] *Psal.* lxxx. 1. [z] *Psal.* xcix. 1.
[a] 1 *Sam.* iv. 4. [b] xxxvii. 16.

Thirdly, *Jeroboam* offended in appointing, and made *Israel* to sin in observing the Feast of Tabernacles, on the fifteenth Day of the Eighth Month, instead of the seventh, says *De Laune*; they are his own words, and therefore mind them; Do not those words (instead of the seventh) imply a confession, that this Feast (of right) ought to have been observ'd on the fifteenth Day of the seventh Month? But whether it be allow'd to do so or not, I shall take it for granted that so it was; not only because *Josephus* does assert it [c], but also because the Scripture seems to intimate as much [d], where it is said, that *Jeroboam offer'd upon the Altar which he had made in* Bethel, *the fifteenth Day of the eighth Month, even in the month which he had devis'd of his own Heart*, &c. From which I observe, he is blam'd for appointing the wrong Month, not the wrong Day of the Month; for 'tis not said in the *Day*, but in the *Month* which *he had devis'd of his own Heart*; which plainly intimates, that it was the Feast of Tabernacles which he appointed to be observ'd on the fifteenth Day of the eighth Month, which was directly contrary to what God had appointed, *Levit.* xxiii. 34, 39. *Numb.* xxix. 12. how then could *De Laune* tell his Reader, that this circumstance of Worship was a matter of indifference, that might be us'd or not us'd, as every one thought good; when 'tis a plain case, that God had fix'd the time for the observation of that Feast on the fifteenth Day of the *seventh* Month? If then under the Gospel Dispensation there be no parallel Case; then (with respect to this par-

[c] *In his eighth Book of the* Jews Antiquities.
[d] 1 *Kings* xii. 33.

ticular

ticular alſo) *De Laune*'s Application is both unjuſt and unreaſonable. But,

Fourthly, *Jeroboam* offended in *making*, and made *Iſrael* to Sin in *joyning*, *with the Prieſts of the high Places*, *which were not of the Sons of* Aaron; *and this thing became ſin unto the Houſe of* Jeroboam, *even to cut it off*, *and to deſtroy it from off the face of the Earth* [e]. What, would God thus cut him off from the face of the Earth, for varying in a particular Ceremony or Circumſtance of Worſhip? No ſuch matter! it muſt be a greater Crime than this, againſt which he will proceed with ſuch Severity!

It's true, God is great as well as good; and as he is to be lov'd for his Goodneſs, ſo is he to be fear'd for his Greatneſs; as then it's a great folly to hope in his Goodneſs, when we do not obey his Commands; ſo is it likewiſe a great impiety, to repreſent him as an auſtere Being, who takes pleaſure in puniſhing thoſe that do not tranſgreſs his Precepts. If then *Jeroboam* be puniſh'd by him, it's becauſe he has greatly offended againſt him! God had expreſſly commanded or appointed, that *Aaron* and his Sons ſhould do the Service of the Tabernacle: Nay, that was not all, but he had as expreſſly forbid any Stranger (that was not of that Tribe) to meddle with it, as all know who have deliberately read over the ſixteenth, ſeventeenth, and eighteenth Chapters of the Book of *Numbers*. Was it not then as high provocation in *Jeroboam* to caſt them out, whom God had plac'd in the Prieſt's Office? And to place them in, whom God had caſt out? Nay, was not *De Laune* likewiſe greatly to blame, for exte-

[e] 1 *Kings* xiii. 33, 34.

nuating (as he did) the Sin of *Jeroboam*, who really was a very great Criminal; and at the same time multiplying Transgressions upon the Church of *England*; when she is really innocent of the Charge by him brought against her? He doubts not, he says [f], *but the judicious will apply this pregnant instance of* Jeroboam's *case*; and where then will the Stone hit does he think? on the Church of *England!* Nay, but let him rather look to it, that it do not fall on his own Pate. For, I must confess, I am not judicious enough to make any better application of it than this; That as *Jeroboam* was for destroying the Order, and the original Constitution of God's Church; for deposing, nay for destroying of Kings, and making Majesty subject to the Subject: So was *De Laune*, and so are our Dissenters [g]; nay, some who call themselves Members of the Church of *England*, also think it an Honour, it seems, to ride in *Jeroboam*'s Troop; and much good may it do them; they have propos'd to themselves a worthy Pattern!

I have now done with our Author's pregnant Instance, and (as I think) have fairly shewn, that the same does not prove the thing for which it was brought, *viz.* That the Church of *England* was to be charg'd with *Will-worship*; because she appoints the use of some indifferent things in the Worship of God, which he hath not expressly commanded. Having done this, I say, I hope I may now go on, and according to the method propos'd,

Fourthly, Shew from plain Fact, that thus to appoint the use of some indifferent Ceremonies in

[f] *Plea*, pag. 16.

[g] *See* Two Sticks made one; *and the* Judgment of whole Kingdoms, *&c.*

the

the Worſhip of God; is not deſtructive of the true Nature of Chriſtian Liberty.

Liberty, I muſt confeſs, is a very deſirable thing, but it is too frequently us'd as a cloke of Maliciouſneſs; and if a pretence of Conſcience be joyn'd with this ill us'd Liberty; what is there that can ſtand before it? It conquers all, binds Kings in Chains, and Nobles in Fetters of Iron; it overturns Church and State; it plunders and kills, and all for the ſake of Liberty and Conſcience. Are thoſe Libertines in Power? then they count it Soul-murder, and putting a Sword into a Mad-man's Hands, to grant an Indulgence to tender Conſciences. Nay, an appointing of a City of Refuge in Mens Conſciences for the Devil to fly to; and a proclaiming Liberty to the Wolves to come into Chriſt's Fold to prey upon his Lambs, *&c* [h]. But on the contrary, are they out of Power, then they ſee it's very agreeable to Chriſtian Charity, to allow them a Liberty of Conſcience, *&c.* with reſpect to the Rites and Cuſtoms of the Church, *&c.* and perhaps it may be ſo with reſpect to ſome; but generally ſpeaking, grant them an inch, and what ſays our Proverb?———

What Liberty was there granted them by the Royal Martyr King CHARLES the Firſt? And, if we may believe Hiſtory, what a bleſſed uſe did they make of it? The King himſelf, we are told, who had (before the Day of their Power) granted ſo much Liberty to them, could not obtain ſo much from them, as to have the Converſation of his own Chaplains, and the uſe of his Common-

[h] *See the Argument for Union in the* London *Caſes; and Schiſm try d and condemn'd.*

Prayer Book. A hard case! but as hard as it was, I can't see how it could be otherwise; for those Libertines had enter'd into a Solemn League and Covenant, by virtue of which, they were oblig'd to endeavour the extirpation of Episcopacy and the Common Prayer [i]; and therefore they could not grant him this, unless they had a mind to be all perjur'd; especially considering they had, (with Hands lifted up to the most high God) expressly sworn, not to suffer any Defection to the contrary Party, or give themselves up to a detestable indifferency or neutrality in this Case. Nay farther, I am well assur'd there was another Ordinance of Parliament made on the twenty third of *August*, 1645. which effectually guards all Passes to the Common-Prayer: For it is therein ordain'd, that if any Person or Persons be found guilty of this great Sin of using the Common-Prayer, they shall pay for the first Offence five Pounds, for the second ten; and if they offend a third time, nothing less than a twelve Month's Imprisonment, without Bail or Mainprize, will excuse. And farther, if any Person or Persons, either wrote, preach'd, or printed any thing against their Directory, or any part thereof, or against any thing therein contain'd, *&c.* he or they who should thus offend, was liable to pay fifty Pounds for their Offences. Does not this shew what an act of Christian Charity it is (in their Opinion) to grant a Liberty of Conscience? Nay, was not their Directory well hedg'd in? And I'll warrant you they look'd after the Hedge so well, that a Church of *England* Man could by no means get over it!

[i] *See the* Solemn League and Covenant; *and the Ordinance of Parliament of the third of* January, 1644.

Is

Is there then any Reason to be given, why the Church of *England* should not keep up as good a Fence about the Common-Prayer? If not, then what Name must we give the Sufferings of *De Laune*, and those who suffer'd, as Mr. *De Foe* says, in the Reign of King *Charles* the Second? Must we call them *Martyrs* or *Malefactors?* If the former, it was for the good old Cause, to depose Kings, and murder Bishops; without which, good Men, they cannot serve God in Purity! witness their *Solemn League and Covenant*, and the *History of Forty One:* Witness their setting up publick Declarations that *Charles Stuart* was no longer their King, and therefore it was the Duty of all Men to kill him and all such as own'd his Government. And it must be confess'd, their Practice (in this case) was agreeable to their Principles; for they met the King, and gave him and his Armies battel, first at *Pentland Hills*, and then at *Bothwel-bridge*. Nay, witness too, the inhuman Murder of the Archbishop of St. *Andrew*'s, and the shooting the Bishop in his Coach in the Streets of *Edenborough*; as likewise the Mobbing of three hundred Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland*, not only out of their *Livings*, but some of them out of their *Lives* too, in the Years 1688, and 1689. Nay farther, witness likewise that *Diocletian* usage, which the poor People of *Glenco* met with from those Zealots about that time: And that which is as bad, or worse than all the rest, they kill'd and destroy'd, and (Papist like) thought they were serving God all the time. Most intolerable! how preposterous it is to hear Men plead for Liberty of Conscience as a Virtue, who yet (when in Power) condemn it as one of the greatest

Vices? But that Glove fits no body's Hands but their own.

But as there is no Sect of Men so good, as to be in all respects free from Exceptions; so neither is there any so bad, as not to find some Friends and Advocates: Some therefore there are who tell us, it's now unjust to charge the Dissenters with what was done in Forty One, *&c.* that we ought not any more to use that Proverb, *The Fathers have eaten sowr Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge*; and the reason, as they say is, because now the time is come, when the Wolf may dwell with the Lamb; and the Leopard, the Calf, and the Lion, all lie together; and therefore *Ephraim* should not envy *Judah*, nor *Judah* vex *Ephraim:* But I think they have mistook either the Text or the Time; for where shall we find the Men that are so gentle, that a little Child (as it there follows) may lead them? I believe we may look long enough (among that sort of Men) before we find them!

They say it's unjust to charge the Children with the faults of the Fathers; I say so too, if the Children forsake their Fathers Principles; but have they renounc'd their Fathers Tenets? Are the Children any better Friends to Episcopacy and Monarchy than their Fathers were? Do they affect the Church of *England* better? Nay, let their own Pens declare, whether they are not much worse affected to it! for instance,

There was many of the old Non-Conformists, that thought it no Sin to joyn with the Church of *England* as Hearers, tho' they could not do so as Teachers; they thought the Church of *England* a true Christian Church, tho' they separated from her on a pretence of greater Purity:

But

But was *De Laune* of this Mind when he wrote his *Plea*? Let the World judge by his Words and Actions! And if *De Foe* be not as good a Friend to it as he, I am mistaken. If then they have not declined from their Fathers Principles, what Crime is it to charge them with their Fathers Facts? Those Facts indeed were actually done by their Fathers, but intentionally by them; for they publickly approve of what was done, and *so manifest themselves the Children of them who killed the Prophets.* Since then the same Cause produces the same Effect, why may not the Effect be charged in the Cause? He cannot be counted a just Man, who does justly for no other Reason, but because he has not an Opportunity to do otherwise: No more is he a Friend to Episcopacy and Monarchy, who destroys them not, for no other Reason, but because it is not in his Power.

Suppose then a Man is so far given up, of God, as to think it lawful, nay in some Cases necessary to depose *Kings*, and set up a *Commonwealth*; to displace *Bishops*, and set up *Presbyterian* Church-government; to extirpate the *Common-Prayer*, and set up a *Directory* it its stead; and withall, suppose him to believe the former Anti-christian and Popish, the latter purely Christian and reformed; and then allow him to have a small matter of Zeal for his Cause, (and what is he good for that has not that) and withal allow him to have full Power to establish that which he thinks best, and can we then believe he will not do it? If we can believe this, we may then believe any thing! They may wheedle and talk of Love and Friendship to the Church, Kings, Bishops, and Common-Prayer, *&c.* but if there be

be not a good Fence kept up againſt them, they will go over and deſtroy them all. I heartily wiſh I may fear the worſt, and in this point be miſtaken: But if the State of things be duly conſidered, I believe we ſhall find too great Reaſon for this Imputation.

For let us but obſerve, whenever thoſe Men are out of Power, the firſt ſtep they make to twiſt themſelves in, is to get an Indulgence for tender Conſciences; grant us this, ſay they, and we ask no more! O that there were ſuch a Heart in them! This indeed is *Jacob*'s Voice, but they have *Eſau*'s Hands! And I wiſh ſome of them at leaſt, do not make uſe of this Pretence, as *Jacob* did of the Skins of the Kids, to deceive his Father, and ſupplant his Brother.

They ſay they deſire no more than Liberty to ſerve God in their own Way: This is freely granted them, let them with all my Heart enjoy it, in the largeſt Extent the Law allows, provided they will be therewith content. But when they have this granted them, are they content with it? Nothing leſs! Now they muſt have Liberty to print, publiſh and ſpread abroad their ſcandalous Libels, to bring the Church and Clergy into Contempt, that ſo they may bring about their own concerted Ends. They ſpeak much againſt Popery, but we may obſerve by the Application, that their Eye is on the Church of *England* all the Time: And if they can imprint an Idea in the Minds of the People, that the Doctrines of the Church of *England* are popiſh and ſuperſtitious, the Clergy looſe and prophane, (and how ſucceſsful have they of late been in this; for were they ever more indecently treated than now?) then the Work is done:

They

They get themſelves a Name among the unthinking Mob, who ſwallow the Bait, as if thoſe were the only good, ſober, and pious Men, that were againſt Popery and Superſtition: And all that do not joyn with them, muſt certainly be either Fools or Atheiſts. Now they muſt have Liberty to ſet up Schools in order to propagate and perpetuate their Schiſm: And in a Word, they muſt have Liberty to divide the Church in order to ſtrengthen the Proteſtant Intereſt, and to deny them this is called *Perſecution*. What? does the Proteſtant Intereſt indeed depend on a caballing Gang of Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptiſts, Quakers, *&c.* Will they now go about to perſwade us, that Faction and Anarchy are the ſupport of the Proteſtant Cauſe? If this be ſo, we are near Popery indeed! But let them ſay, and others think what they will to the contrary; I am really of Opinion, it will ever be true, that thoſe Men who beſt affect the Faith, and moſt conſtantly and conſcientiouſly hold Communion with the Church of *England*, will be found the beſt Friends both to the Church and State of this Kingdom. For,

Firſt, If we view our Anti-epiſcopal Men, can it be thought that they are good, much leſs the beſt, Friends of the Church; when their Principles are, and no doubt but their Practice would be (had they an Opportunity) to deſtroy her Conſtitution and Government? When more than forty had bound themſelves in a ſolemn Oath, to eat nothing till they had killed *Paul*[k], then there is but one ſtep betwixt him and Death!

---

[k] *Acts* xxiii. 12.

they

they then want nothing but an Opportunity to execute the Villany! If they can obtain the chief Captain's Promiſe, to have him brought forth, (under a Pretence of knowing ſomething more perfectly) they will be ſure to kill him, and ſo ſend his Knowledge and him away together. Will you now call thoſe Men *Paul*'s beſt Friends? So (with Sorrow of Heart I ſpeak it) there were, I ſay not forty, but perhaps more than *forty Thouſand* who had bound themſelves in a *Solemn League* and *Covenant* to deſtroy the Church's Conſtitution and Government, and they only wanted an Opportunity to execute the Deſign. Will you then call theſe Men the beſt Friends of the Church? Are they the Men that guard her Conſtitution? Then give the Wolf the Lamb to keep! *Paul* was ſafe in the Caſtle, but in all probability he would not have been ſo, if he had been delivered up to the Will of his Enemies: So the Church is ſafe, when under the Government of Epiſcopal Divines: But—— I leave the Application to the Reader, and ſo paſs on,

Secondly, To obſerve that *Anti-epiſcopal*, are generally if not conſtantly attended with *Anti-monarchical* Principles, although in the ſolemn League and Covenant they pretended otherwiſe.

They ſaid indeed, nay (which is more) they ſwore, "That they would in their ſeveral Vocations, ſincerely, really, and conſtantly endeavour "with their Eſtates and Lives, mutually to preſerve the Rights and Privileges of the Parliaments, and the Liberties of the Kingdom: And "to preſerve and defend the King's Perſon and "Authority (pray obſerve, how he was defended "and preſerved by them) in the Preſervation "and

" and Defence of the true Religion, and Liber-
" ties of the Kingdom, that the World may
" bear Witneſs with our Conſciences of our
" Loyalty, and that we have no Deſign to di-
" miniſh his Majeſty's juſt Power and Greatneſs:
Loyal Men indeed! And do not our Whigs pre-
tend the ſame thing: But ſince Men's Actions
beſt demonſtrate the Truth of their Intentions;
let me ask, did they do all this? Did they de-
fend the King's Majeſty, the Rights of Parlia-
ment, and the Liberties of the Kingdoms? No-
thing leſs, for they deſtroyed them all! If this fell
out contrary to what they intended, it demon-
ſtrates however, how unskilful they were to re-
form things amiſs; and withal, it ſhews the Ob-
ſervation of King *James* (in the Diſpute at
at *Hampton-Court*) *no Biſhop, no King*, to be true:
for ſo it fell out, whether it was intended or not.

The Peace and well being of this State, does
in a great meaſure depend on the Peace and well
being of the Church, and ſo on the contrary:
The Church commanding Obedience to the civil
Magiſtrate, and the civil Magiſtrate commands
that Peace and good Order be kept in the
Church: The beſt way then to keep the Faith
ſound, and the State quiet, is by any means
to preſerve the Church's Peace; and conſequent-
ly, whoever is an Enemy to the *Peace* of the
Church, cannot be a *good Friend* to the *State*.
For Inſtance, the Church of *England* does aſſert [1],
and all the Clergy ſwear to the Truth of it,
*That it is not lawful to reſiſt the ſupream Power
on any Pretence whatſoever:* Contrary to which,

[1] *Hom.* xiii & xxi.

we have among us a complicated Sect of *Whigs* and *Diſſenters*, who (like *Gebal* and *Ammon*, and *Amalek*, with the *Moabites*, *Hagarenes* and others of old) have confederated (as they then did) againſt the Church, and condemn this Doctrine as popiſh: And this has of late caus'd great Diſputes, and been the *Shibboleth* by which to diſtinguiſh Party from Party; and it's hard to ſay, whether the *Church* or *State* hath ſuffered moſt by this Diſtinction.

But be that as it will, our *Whigs* ſay, they love the Church and its Settlement as well as the beſt; nay, that they are her heartieſt and beſt Friends: *Then Lord, it's time thou have Mercy on Sion, yea the time is come when her Friends are turned to be her Accuſers!* Is he a dutiful Child who calls his Mother Whore? No more is he a Friend, much leſs a Son of the Church, who condemns her Doctrine as popiſh and ſuperſtitious, which is ſpiritual Whoredom. Doth the *Whig* ſay, that the Church's Doctrine is popiſh, and all thoſe popiſhly inclined that believe it? The Diſſenter indeed ſays ſo; but what, are *Herod* and *Pilate* made Friends? Yes truly, *Simeon* and *Levi* are Brethren in Iniquity; the *Whig* and *Diſſenter* embark both in a Ship, they ſteer to the ſame Point of the Compaſs, and it's probable their Port lies in Latitude *Forty-one*. If they have not the ſame Intereſt in View, why ſhould they ſo conſtantly club together in all Elections, and by the ſame artful Inſinuations endeavour to make the World believe, that whoever is not a *Whig* or a *Diſſenter*, is certainly a *Papiſt!* But, if the Doctrine of the Church be popiſh, as they would willingly have us believe, why then are our Clergy oblig'd to ſubſcribe to it?

If

If it be not popiſh and ſuperſtitious, why do they thus repreſent it? Why are ſo many Men charged as being popiſhly affected, for no other Reaſon but becauſe they believe what the Church has enjoyn'd, and all her Clergy have ſworn to maintain?

But as Men in danger of drowning will lay hold of any thing to ſave themſelves, ſo our *Whigs* to avoid this Imputation (of condemning the Doctrine of the Church) tell us, that the Clergy do not ſubſcribe to the Truth of the aforeſaid Doctrine in the Senſe *the moſt* take it: But how ſhall we be ſure of this, was it ever put to a Poll? If they do not ſubſcribe to the Articles of the Church in the Senſe that moſt take them, in what Senſe do they ſubſcribe to them? In the Senſe of the *Impoſer*, or every *Subſcriber* in his own Senſe? If the former, then whoever cannot ſubſcribe to them in the plain, literal and grammatical Senſe, cannot ſubſcribe to them in the Impoſers Senſe; and conſequently are not duly qualified for the having any Benefice in the Church; and if without this Qualification they could not have any Benefice, I ſee no Reaſon why without it they ſhould hold any. But if we admit the latter, then the Church has only propoſed Articles, and left every Subſcriber to put what Comment he pleaſes on each of them: But this is directly contrary to what is ſaid in the Declaration prefixed to thoſe Articles; for according to that, no Man may put his own Senſe or Comment to be the meaning of the Articles, but is to take them in the literal and grammatical Senſe. Nay, the very Reaſon of the thing ſuppoſes this.

For

For how is it likely there will be any Unity in the Faith, (which is the thing intended by thoſe Articles,) if one whimſical Expoſitor be allowed to cry out, Lo, here is the true Expoſition of the Articles of the Church? Why may not another ſay, Lo, it is here? One ſays it is to the Right, another ſays it is to the Left-hand, *&c.* and then which of them muſt I believe? Muſt I believe them all? Then I muſt believe Contradictions! Muſt I believe this, not that Man? What Reaſons does he give for it? Muſt I believe none at all? Then to what Purpoſe have we Articles? But if after all, we muſt have Expoſitions as well as Articles, whither muſt we go; to what point of the Compaſs muſt I ſteer to find them? Muſt I aſcend up into Heaven, or go to an infallible Chair for this? But may I not as ſoon find Articles of Faith as Expoſitions? In ſhort, this is ſo far from excuſing, that it's in Reality bantering the Clergy, for ſwearing to maintain and defend the Doctrine of the Church, and yet (according to thoſe Men) the moſt part of them know not what her Doctrine is; and their Oath (if thoſe Men ſay true) is like the *Romiſh* Tranſubſtantiation; an Accident without a Subject.

According to the thirteenth Homily of the Church of *England*, wicked Rulers have their Authority from God, and ſo are in no Caſe to be reſiſted; the ſame is aſſerted in the twenty-firſt Homily: And if any of the Clergy refuſe to ſubſcribe to the Truth of this, they are (according to the Act of Uniformity) deemed incapable of any Place or Benefice; what then is to be done? Why firſt ſubſcribe, that it is not lawful to reſiſt the ſupreme Power on any Pretence whatſoever;

ever; and then there is work for the *Whig*; now let him explain, and he'll tell you thus,

If things go well, then muſt you be
Subject to Supreme Majeſtry:
But Majeſty is but a Name,
'Twas we confer'd it, he's to blame
If he abuſe his Truſt.

But he's a Man as well as we,
We were not made his Slaves to be.
If then he does his Truſt abuſe,
We'll teach him better how to uſe,
And not abuſe his Truſt.

It's true indeed he is our King,
And that's a very ſacred Thing:
But if he's mind ſo to remain,
He muſt, nay ſhall our Sect maintain;
If not, we'll him Reſiſt.

Is not this a very fine Expoſition on the beforeſaid Articles and Homilies? What, firſt ſwear, and then forſwear? If this may be call'd explaining, what is contradicting them? Nay, then let the *Whig* (if he can) tell me, what is Treaſon and Rebellion? Does not an univerſal Affirmative, deſtroy a particular Negative? If it be true that all Men are reaſonable Creatures, then it is falſe that ſome Men are not ſo: So likewiſe, if it be true that in *no caſe* we may reſiſt, as the Homilies declare; then is it falſe that in *ſome caſes* we may reſiſt: If the Church of *England* allows this Liberty in explaining her Articles, I think I have not departed from my Subject; if ſhe does not, I am ſure I have made good my Argument, that ſome

Men use their Liberty as a Cloak for maliciousness.

I must confess I have made a large Digression from that which I chiefly intended as the Subject of this Enquiry; but being now returning, and withal, being upon the Object of Liberty, I hope I may be excus'd, especially considering, I have not digress'd, farther than others take liberty to transgress. But to return to our Question, which was to enquire, Whether the appointing the use of some indifferent things in the Worship of God, which he has not commanded, does destroy our Christian Liberty.

Now, in order to clear this matter, and give such an answer to the Question as is satisfactory to my own Conscience; I think it may not be improper in the first place to inquire, wherein Christian Liberty is, and wherein it is not founded; for I conceive if this can be once well settled, the Answer to the beforesaid Question will be plain and easy.

First then I take it, that Christian Liberty is founded in the Judgment, rather than in the Practice; that is to say, in thinking these things free, which God has left so, rather than in doing, or not doing, what we think expedient; and if so, then may Christian Liberty be preserv'd where it is restrain'd. But to give you an instance,

It's generally thought the Liberty of the Will lies in the Power of determining its self either way; and that the actual determination of it does not so take away the internal Power of the Soul, but that there may still be a possibility of doing, where there is no possibility the thing can be done, because it is otherwise determin'd by some divine

divine Decree; as in the case of selling *Joseph* into *Egypt*, and the not breaking the Bones of Christ on the Cross, *&c.* the case is the same with respect to Christian Liberty, which may be preserv'd, tho' it be restrain'd. But,

If any do still doubt of this, I would ask them, whether they think St. *Paul*, for instance, understood wherein Christian Liberty did consist? And knowing it, whether he acted according to his Knowledge or not? If he did, then it's plain from undeniable Fact, that Christian Liberty is founded in freedom of *Judgment*, rather than in freedom of Practice; as will appear very plain to any Man that will take the trouble to observe, how ready *Paul* was in complying with (rather than offend) the Judaizing Christians in many things, when done with an opinion of freedom, as in circumcising *Timothy*, Acts xvi. 3. in observing or not observing of Days, in eating, or not eating some kind of Meats, *&c.* But the same Apostle would by no means circumcise *Titus*, Gal. ii. 34. Why? because there were some who would make it *necessary* to circumcise, whom *Paul* withstood, and would not have the Church brought into Bondage; we see then *Paul* could circumcise, or he could let it alone: He could observe some Days, eat some sorts of Meats, for instance, such as had been offer'd to Idols, or he could let it alone; neither of those things (in themselves consider'd) destroy Christian Liberty: No, it's the doing, or not doing them with an *opinion* of *necessity* that does that: He that makes it necessary not to touch, taste, or handle those things, does as effectually destroy Christian Liberty, as he that makes it necessary to do so; which things being premis'd, let us now draw the Parallel to our present case.

Let us ſuppoſe it now as lawful to kneel or ſtand when we pray, as it was for the primitive Chriſtians to eat, or not eat, ſome kind of Meats; to obſerve, or not obſerve, ſome Days: And in a word, that it now is as lawful to kneel or ſit when we receive the Sacrament, to uſe or not uſe a Form of Prayer, *&c.* as it then was for *Paul* to circumciſe *Timothy*, and purify himſelf after the manner of the *Jews*, &c[m]. Let us ſuppoſe this, I ſay, and then it will neceſſarily follow, that I may now uſe a form of Prayer, and yet preſerve my Liberty ſtill: I may receive the Sacrament kneeling, or in the Morning, or at Midnight, with leaven'd or unleaven'd Bread, *&c.* and preſerve my Chriſtian Liberty ſtill; and the reaſon is, becauſe Chriſtian Liberty is founded in freedom of *Judgment*, not in freedom of *Practice:* Since then I do thoſe things (as *Paul* did thoſe before mention'd) with an opinion of *freedom*, with reſpect to the things themſelves; and only with a conſequential neceſſity of obeying thoſe whom God hath ſet over me in Church and State, and who have commanded, that I ſhould ſo do thoſe before mention'd things; for my part I cannot ſee, why one ſhould not be as lawful as the other.

For certainly, if *Paul* could (without breach of Chriſtian Liberty) comply with the advice of the Church at *Jeruſalem*, and purify himſelf ſeven Days according to the cuſtom of the *Moſaick* Law; if he could circumciſe *Timothy*, and have his Conſcience ſo flexible, as to become a *Jew* to the *Jew*, and a *Greek* among the *Greeks*, and yet

[m] *Acts* xvi. 3. *and* xxi. *from* 20 *to* 28 *verſe.*

preſerve

preſerve his Chriſtian Liberty: Why may not I, or any other Perſon do the ſame thing?

I make no doubt but *Paul* thought it a matter of Indifferency whether he circumcis'd or not; whether he purify'd himſelf or not; whether he eat or eat not ſome ſort of Meats; obſerv'd or not obſerv'd ſome particular Days, *&c.* But when he came to *Jeruſalem*, the Church there (leaving his Judgment free) determin'd his Practice to purify himſelf as is before ſaid. So likewiſe, I believe its lawful to uſe an extemporary Prayer; to receive the Sacrament ſitting, or in the Evening, or at Midnight, with leaven'd or unleaven'd Bread, *&c.* but ſince thoſe things are not commanded, nor the contrary Cuſtoms forbid, why may not I, or any other Perſon (after the Example of the great St. *Paul*) determine my Practice, by the Cuſtoms of the Church in which I live? Sure I am, (if we may believe Hiſtory) it was the advice of St. *Ambroſe* to St. *Auguſtin*, that he ſhould (with reſpect to Rituals) obſerve the Cuſtoms of the Place or Church where he came, if he was minded not to give or take offence. Which things being premis'd, I conclude (and as I think juſtly too) that it is not the determination of the Practice; but the confinement of the Conſcience, to or from the uſe of thoſe things, that deſtroys Chriſtian Liberty.

Thus have I done with this Liberty; and tho' I have ſaid nothing to it but what is ſatisfactory to my own Conſcience; yet I leave every Man to himſelf to judge of it as he ſees cauſe; and ſo I'll proceed according to my propos'd method,

Fifthly, To enquire, whether the Ceremonies now us'd in the Church of *England*, were likewiſe us'd in the primitive Church.

But before I come to the Examination of Particulars, I think it may not be amiss to observe, that *De Laune* and I agree about the Age of pure Antiquity, and indeed till this be determined, we can never be certain what was, or what was not the Practice of it. It's agreed then, whatever (in the ensuing Discourse) comes within, or falls without the Compass of the first four hundred Years after Christ, is to be accounted either practised or not practised in the *Primitive Church.* But,

Secondly, Let it also be observed, that (in this Particular) our Question is not *De jure* but *De facto*, not whether the primitive Church did well in appointing the Use of some Ceremonies, but whether she did appoint any well or ill. But then,

" If, says he[n], the Pattern (for using our " Rites and Ceremonies) be fetched from those " primitive Times, we would enquire into these " two Things: First, by what Rule or Reason " they should be a Pattern to us, so as to have " their Rites and Services imposed on us for our " Ritual? Secondly, whether there were not " great Errors and Superstitions in those Times, " as well as in the succeeding Ages? And then " after he has made a Recital of some of those " Errors, he concludes thus[o], so that from the " Consideration of the Errors and Superstitions " abounding in those Times, there is no ground " why our first Reformers should propose them " for our Pattern; for if in one thing, why not " in another, says he? Very diverting indeed! What first deny, and then own the Fact? If the Church of *England* be so contrary to the

---

[n] *Plea*, pag. 18. [o] *Plea*, pag. 26.

primitive

primitive Pattern as he pretends, why does he condemn her, for not agreeing with a Pattern he does not approve? If the ancient Church were wholly corrupted, then why does he find fault with us for not agreeing with it? If it were not wholly corrupted, what Fault can there be in agreeing with it in those Things in which there is no Corruption? Indeed the Antiquity of a Custom that is pleaded in bar of Truth, as one well observes [p], is of no Force; but if a Dispute happen about Rituals, and what Ceremonies are decent, *&c.* I know no better Way to decide this, than to refer to the Practice of the primitive Church. But then, if we agree with them in one thing, says he, why not in another? What, if with *Origen* I believe that the Wicked are punished in Hell, must I with him also believe, that that Punishment shall not be eternal? If with St. *Peter* I believe that *Jesus* is the *Christ the Son of the living God*, must I with *Peter* also deny him? This is so extravagantly foolish, as not to need more Words to confute that, which does so apparently carry its own Confutation with it. But then,

Secondly, He asks what Rule or Reason there is, for imposing their Customs on us? To which, I answer, there's just as much Reason for it, as is to be met with in his Question, and that is just none at all. For certainly he was not ignorant of what the Church of *England* asserts, "[q] That every particular or national Church, "hath Authority to ordain, change, and abolish "Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, *&c.* if

[p] *Pellen's Good old Way.* [q] *Article* 34.

" then it be not neceſſary (as this Article ſays it " is not) that Traditions and Ceremonies be in " all Places one or utterly like, becauſe at all " Times they have been divers, and may be " changed according to the diverſity of Coun- " tries, Times, and Mens Manners, *&c.* If it be ſo, I ſay, What Reaſon is there in his Demand? If every national Church have Authority to ordain, change and aboliſh Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, *&c.* then ſure the Church of *England* among the reſt has ſuch Authority: If then ſuch Authority ſhe hath, then ſure ſuch ſhe may uſe, and conſequently may chooſe her own Ceremonies: But if in chooſing ſhe pay a due reſpect to the Practice of the ancient Church, and takes in ſome of the ancient Ceremonies; yet it muſt ſtill be ſuppoſed that in ſo doing, ſhe acts conſiſtent with her own Liberty; and conſequently does this willingly and not by Conſtraint, being under no Obligation one way or other. Thus having removed the Objections caſt in my way by *De Laune*; and having likewiſe propoſed the thirty-fourth Article of our Church as a ſure rule to walk by in this preſent Enquiry: I ſhall now deſcend to Particulars, and as I go take the Advice of Dr. *Calamy*, and not barely rely on the Authority of one ſide or the other, but when I have equally heard both ſides, ſhall determine my Practice to that, which I ſee the beſt Reaſons for.

Firſt, then he tells us[r], " That kneeling at " the Altar, or at the Sacrament of the Lord's-

[r] *Plea*, pag. 22.

" Sup-

" Supper, is but a novel Invention, never known
" in the World before Tranſubſtantiation, *&c.*
" That Pope *Honorius* in the Year 1214. or-
" dained *Kneeling* at the Sacrament, and his Pre-
" deceſſor *Innocent* the Third *Tranſubſtantia-*
" *tion*, *&c.*

Well, ſuppoſe I ſhould grant all this (as indeed I ſhall not till I ſee it better proved) what is the Conſequence of it? Why then Pope *Honorius* decreed it, and conſequently it was not in uſe in the primitive Church. Well, admit all this, yet how does it appear that it's unlawful to uſe any thing that the primitive Church did not, or that Pope *Honorius* decreed? If every national Church has Authority to chooſe its own Ceremonies, as the Church of *England* ſays it hath; and if kneeling at the Sacrament be only a Ceremony or Circumſtance of Worſhip, as no doubt it is, then it's no great matter whether the primitive Church uſed it or not, or whether *Honorius* or *Innocent*, *&c.* decreed it or not: For be it either or be it neither, we are under no Obligation to do or omit, what has been by them either practiſed or decreed. But for Argument-ſake, pray how does it appear that Pope *Honorius* decreed it? We are told ſo in the Decretals, ſays he; and *Peter Martyr* ſays, that to maintain Tranſubſtantiation and real Preſence, it was brought into the Church: But there is very little Reaſon to believe this!

For, if we may believe Dr. *Horneck* and others, it is a plain Caſe that Tranſubſtantiation was in vogue almoſt 150 Years before *Honorius*'s Days, and conſequently if that Doctrine could ſubſiſt 150 Years, without being ſupported by the kneeling

kneeling Geſture, I think there is little account to be taken of what *Peter Martyr* aſſerts. And as for Pope *Honorius*'s decreeing the kneeling Geſture, that (as the ſame Doctor obſerves [s], is alſo manifeſtly falſe; for all that he ordained was, that the Body ſhould be decently bowed, when the holy Symbols were lifted up by the Prieſt. Nay farther, if they will believe Mr. *Prynne* Dr. *Burgeſſe* and others, mentioned in the Caſe of Kneeling in the *London Caſes* [t]; Kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacrament, was never any inſtituted Ceremony of the Church of *Rome*. But if any deſire farther Satisfaction in this Point, let them at their Leaſure conſult the before-ſaid *London Caſes*, and I doubt not but they will find what *De Laune* aſſerts, (with reſpect to this Particular) to be manifeſtly falſe and groundleſs. But,

Secondly, "As for the *Surplice*, ſays he [u], the "Fathers uſed it not, though it's clear the Pa-"gans did; from whence the Papiſts had it, and "we from them. Well, the Fathers uſed it not, what then; it's but a Circumſtance of Worſhip, and therefore may lawfully be uſed by us upon the before-ſaid Principle, though it ſhould be granted the Fathers uſed it not. But how does it appear that the Fathers uſed it not? Why, he ſays, they did not: Well, then it muſt be ſo! he ſays indeed, that Pope *Adrian* brought in the uſe of it *Anno* 796. but that is a great Miſtake if we may believe Mr. *Pellen*, Mr. *Hooker*, Dr. *Cave*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and many more who might be produced; who have (from good Authority)

[s] *Crucified Jeſus*, p. 598. [t] P. 37, 38. [u] *Plea*, p. 22.

prov'd

prov'd it to have been in use 500 Years and more before his Time.

However, since it is but a Circumstance of Worship, and since our Church has expressly declared[w], "That she means not to attribute "any Holiness, or special Worthiness to the "wearing of the said Surplice or any of the "Priests Garments, but appoints them only for "the sake of Decency, Gravity, and Order as "is before expressed: Since this is so, I say; one would think no sober Man (that was well instructed in the Nature of Christian Liberty) could doubt about it. But if after all, there be any (as I hope there be but few) that doubt of the Lawfulness of it, all that I shall say to such is, to advise them to read the *London Cases*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s *Unreasonableness* of *Separation*, the *Friendly Debate* or *Hooker*'s *Ecclesiastical Politie*, *&c.* and I doubt not but they will find sufficient Reasons to convince them. But then,

Thirdly, "As for the *Sign* of the *Cross* in (I "say after) Baptism upon the Forehead only, "we read of no such Rite among the Ancients, "says he, *&c.* but why then does he tell us in the very next Paragraph, that the Ancients after Baptism, did sign the Baptiz'd with a Cross upon the Head and Breast? What, did they use a Custom they knew not of? But why does he add, upon the Forehead only? Should we please him better, if we should Cross the Breast too? If not, why is this added? If we should, the Argument according to him stands thus: To cross the Bap-

[w] *Canon* 74.

tiz'd

tiz'd on the Forehead and Breaſt, is conſonant to the primitive Pattern; but to croſs the Forehead *only*, is popiſh and ſuperſtitious: If then in this Particular we are to be blamed, it is becauſe we are not ſuperſtitious and popiſh enough.

" The *Ancients* did indeed ſign the Baptiz'd " with a Croſs on his Head and Breaſt, ſays he, and " anointed him with Chriſm as a diſtinct order " from Baptiſm: But they us'd no ſuch ſigning " in the act of Baptiſm as part of that Ordi- " nance. Pray obſerve by his own Confeſſion, there was ſuch a Rite uſed among the Ancients, and yet there was not according to his Aſſertion. How ſhall we reconcile this Diſcord? Why thus, " They uſed this Rite as a diſtinct order " from Baptiſm, but we uſe it in the act of Bap- " tiſm as part of that Ordinance: What will he not ſay that will ſay this! Does not the Church of *England* plainly and expreſſly aſſert[x], " That " the Child is fully and perfectly baptized before " the Sign of the Croſs is made? and ſo, it " being uſed, adds nothing to the Vertue or " Perfection of Baptiſm: Nor being omitted, " detracts any thing from the Effect and Sub- " ſtance of it? Nay farther, it's obſervable that the Sign of the Croſs is mention'd (in this very Canon) among things indifferent and alterable: And conſequently, is not counted as a part of that Ordinance, which is of perpetual Obligation in the Church of Chriſt. Nay farther yet, if Baptiſm is the Door, that is to ſay, *the initiatory Sacrament*, by which we are admitted into Chriſt's Fold, and ſo counted among

[x] *Can.* 30.

the

the Number of his faithful and elect Children; then may we observe, (for it's a plain Case) both from the Office of private as well as of publick Baptism, that the Child is received into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, before the Sign of the Cross is made: How then could he have the Face to tell the World, that the Church of *England* used the Sign of the Cross, as part of the Ordinance of Baptism? will you call him a Gentleman, a Christian and a Scholar, who spreads such false and scandalous Reports? Yes, for we must excuse small Faults, in a Man guilty of so many great ones! However, he goes on and tells us, "That the Reformers in *Edward the Sixth's* "Time, did as the first Service-book makes "mention, sign the Elements three Times with "the Sign of the Cross, and also the Child on "his Forehead and Breast, but all this is laid "aside (he should have excepted the crossing "of the Forehead) and a new thing taken up, "which is neither to be met with in Antiquity, "nor the first Pattern of our *Reformers*.

As to what is to be met with in Antiquity concerning this Ceremony, he gives us but a very imperfect account of it. He says indeed, we read of no such Rite among the Ancients, and that it seems must pass for Proof: But if this Rite was not in use in the *primitive Church*, as he says it was not; why did he not acquaint us with the Pope's Name, that first brought it in use in the Church? But if he did not know, it's not to be wonder'd at why he did not name him!

It is I must confess somewhat difficult to tell, who first brought it in use in the Church, if it was brought in at any time since the apostolick Age.

Age. However, this is certain, it was in use in the Days of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, as is confess'd by Mr. *Stenet* [y] and others, who were no Friends to the use of it; and consequently was in use within the first four hundred years after Christ, (which is the time by him fix'd for pure Antiquity) as might be made good in many particulars, if I thought there was any occasion for it; but finding this already done to my hand by Dr. *Cave* [z], Bishop *Taylor* [a], the *London Cases*, Mr. *Hooker*'s *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and many others who have wrote on that Subject, I shall, for brevity sake, omit citations, and refer my Reader to the beforesaid Books for more ample Satisfaction.

But then, why does he call the crossing the Child on the Forehead a new thing, not to be met with in Antiquity, nor in the first Pattern of our Reformers, when at the same time he confesses both? For if the Ancients after Baptism did sign the baptiz'd with a Cross on his Head and Breast; and if the first Reformers in *Edward* the *Sixth*'s time, did (as the first Service Book makes mention) sign the Child on the Forehead and Breast, as he asserts they did; then sure it can be no very hard matter to find this Ceremony in use, not only among the first Reformers; but also among the Ancients too. But to proceed,

" *Fourthly*, As for the Order and Office of " *Confirmation* in the Rubrick and Liturgy, it is " another thing, says he, than the Ancients us'd. " How does this appear? Why first *theirs was* " *done with Christ*, *ours not so*; *theirs was done*

[y] *In his Answer to* Russen, *p.* 75.
[z] *In his Primitive Christ.* p. 212, 213.
[a] *In his Duct. Dub.* Lib. 3. p. 327.

" *only by the Hands of a Biſhop*, ſo is ours; *but* " *they us'd to do it immediately after Baptiſm was* " *adminiſter'd, as a diſtinct Ordinance from it*; " and is it not diſtinct with us too? but *they* " *us'd to do it with two Croſſes, one on the Fore-* " *head, the other on the Breaſt*, &c. It ſeems then (if in this particular we are culpable) it is becauſe we uſe not ſuperſtitious Ceremonies enow. As for Croſſes and Chriſm in Confirmation, it's true we uſe them not, neither is there any occaſion for us ſo to do, if we reſpect either the thing it ſelf, or the Practice of the ancient Church in this particular. " For if we may believe Dr. *Cave* [b], " thoſe who had (in the primitive Church) re- " ceived compleat Baptiſm, were not afterwards " anointed at their Confirmation, for which the " *Council* of *Orange* [c] is moſt expreſs and clear. " And indeed, ſays he, that Confirmation was " often adminiſter'd without this Unction, no " Man can doubt, that knows the ſtate of thoſe " Times, being done only by ſolemn impoſition " of the Biſhops Hands, and by devout and pi- " ous Prayers, *&c.* Dr. *Willet* ſays the ſame thing [d]; and to omit many others that I could name that have ſo aſſerted, Mr. *Perkins* tells us [e], " That the Chriſm or anointing the Baptiz'd, " which was us'd in Antiquity, had its inſtituti- " on from *Sylveſter*, as *Platina* ſays in his Life. " He it was that firſt commanded the uſe there- " of, which before was free to be done or not, *&c.* " And indeed, ſays he, in *Juſtin Martyr*'s time, " there was no uſe of Chriſm in Baptiſm; and " a little after he ſays, it was not in *Tertullian*'s

[b] *Primitive Chriſt.* Part 1. Chap. 10. p. 219.
[c] *Can.* 1. [d] *Synop. Papiſm.* p. 813.
[e] *In his Demonſtration of the Problem*, Lib. 2. p. 652.

" time;

" time; and St. *Auguſtine* ſays, Impoſition of " Hands, what is it but Prayer over the Perſon? So then, our Confirmation ſtands not in need of Croſſes and Chriſm, to make it correſpond with that which was us'd in the primitive Church, becauſe it does that much better without them. Well, be that as it will, he tells us however, " That Archbiſhop *Cranmer* does fully acknow- " ledge, that there is no direction in Scripture " for *Confirmation*. I have not the Manuſcript " he ſpeaks of by me, and ſo muſt take his word, that the Citation is fair, tho' at the ſame time I have very little reaſon to do ſo, having ſome Reaſons to believe it was the popiſh Sacrament of Confirmation the Biſhop was ſpeaking of; but whether it were ſo or not, it is of no great moment; for ſince the Scripture is of no private Interpretation, I may well oppoſe him with the Authority of Biſhop *Taylor*, Dr. *Hamond*, Mr. *Baxter*, and many more who are produc'd againſt him by Dr. *Cave* and others, particularly in the Diſpute at *Hampton-Court*.

But this is only oppoſing one Man with the Authority of another; therefore for a concluſion of this Particular, I ſhall adviſe all who are againſt our manner of Confirmation, to take their own time, and anſwer (if they can) Mr. *Saywell*'s Arguments for the divine Rite of Confirmation [f]; and when they have done that, it may be time enough to direct them to ſome others. But then,

" *Fifthly*, As for the Office of Baptiſm of In- " fants, as enjoin'd in the Liturgy for Regenera-

[f] *In a Sermon preach'd at* Huntingdon *on the* 20*th of* June, 1700.

" tion

" tion on the Deed done, says he [g], and to be " perform'd by *Gossips* who are to profess Faith " and Repentance in the Infant's name and stead, " it's generally scrupled and disown'd by the Dis- " senters, (as savouring too much of Popery) tho' " the greatest part of them do baptize their In- " fants. Well, who can help it, if they will do what is generally scrupled and disown'd by them? Nay, who can help what they will scruple and disown?

But what does he mean by all this confus'd Jargon? Baptism of Infants, Regeneration, Deed done, Liturgy, Gossips, Faith and Repentance, *&c.* had much Learning made him mad? Or was it much Ignorance that had made him so? For whereabouts in the Liturgy may we find, that Baptism is appointed for Regeneration on the Deed done? According to the Church of *England*'s notion of it, *Baptism is an outward and visible Sign, of an inward and spiritual Grace, given unto us, ordain'd by Christ himself as a means whereby we receive the same:* Here then is an outward and visible Sign, the application of Water to the Person baptiz'd, but the inward and spiritual Grace by which we are regenerated, is (in the use of this Ordinance) given unto us by Christ himself. Agreeable to which, the Minister is directed to pray, that the Person baptiz'd may receive Remission of his Sins, not by the Deed done, but by spiritual Regeneration; and again, *Grant*, says he, *that whosoever is here dedicated to thee by our Office and Ministry, may also be endu'd with heavenly virtues*, &c. And a little after, *Sanctify this Water, to the mystical washing away*

[g] *Plea*, p. 24.

of Sin, &c. From all which it's plainly intimated, that the outward and visible Sign (that is, Baptism with Water) may sometimes be, where spiritual Regeneration, or the Baptism of the Spirit, does not take place. But it's objected, Does not the Church of *England* look on Infants (before Baptism is administer'd to them) as Children of Wrath, as Aliens from the Commonwealth of *Israel*; Strangers to the Covenant of Promise, without hope, and without God in the World; but no sooner is a little Water pour'd on them, but the Minister gives God thanks, for that it hath pleas'd him to regenerate the Party baptiz'd with his Holy Spirit, and for receiving him or her for his own Child by adoption, *&c.* Nay farther, if the Child had dy'd before it had been thus baptiz'd, it would not have been allow'd Christian Burial, say they; but being so, (if he depart this Life immediately, before he has done either good or evil) ye pronounce him happy and blessed, *&c.* Now to this mighty Objection which so much puzzles some, (and I must confess it was formerly my own Case) I shall return this fair, and as I think, full Answer.

With respect to the first part of the Objection, I say with the Church of *England* [h], "That "original Sin standeth not in the following of "*Adam*, (as the *Pelagians* vainly talk) but it is "the fault and corruption of the Nature of eve-"ry Man, that naturally is engendred of the "Offspring of *Adam*, and for which every Per-"son so born into this World, deserveth God's "Wrath and Damnation, which none can escape; but by the alone Merits of Jesus Christ, made

[h] *Article the 9th.*

over

over to them by a most gracious Covenant; the visible Sign of which (under the Gospel Dispensation) is Baptism only. So then (if we proceed by the Rules of Judgment and Charity) we must at least suppose him to have the thing signify'd, who is vouchsaf'd the Blessing of the Sign. And so on the contrary, there is no Rule for us to judge him possess'd of the thing signify'd, who is so unhappy as to be deny'd the visible Sign: I speak in a Covenant way, and judging by Rule; but far be it from me, to limit the holy One of *Israel*; who is not, as we are, ty'd to Ordinances; which being premis'd, I shall now proceed to the heart of the Objection.

If Baptism is not appointed for Regeneration on the Deed done, why is it, nay how can it be said (in the Office of Baptism) that the Child which but now (before a little Water was cast on it) was a Child of Wrath, is become a Child of Grace, and regenerated by the Spirit? Why very well, and very truly it may be said so! but that I may be as intelligible as is possible; I'll give the objecter an instance in a like case, and then proceed.

Let him then consider, that *Adam*'s Transgression has the same evil effect on the *Jew* that it has on the *Gentile*: But under the *Mosaick* Dispensation, God was pleas'd to make a Covenant with the former, not so with the latter; unto which Covenant he was likewise pleas'd to add a visible Badge or Seal; obliging all that expected benefit by the one, to partake of the other: So then, whoever was of the *Jews* Posterity coming to be eight Days old, and was not circumcis'd, that Soul was to be cut off from *Israel*; and tho' he had not in act done either good or

evil, yet *he hath broken my Covenant*, says the Text, *Gen.* xvii. 14. until he was circumcis'd, he was not counted of the number of God's People, but as a Stranger and Foreigner; one that did not belong to the Houshold of Faith; one that was no Son of faithful *Abraham*, and consequently had no privilege in the Covenant made to him and his Seed; and in short, (to use the Apostle's words whilst in this uncircumcis'd condition) *he was without hope, and without God in the World.* A most deplorable State indeed! but now take the same Person, and the same day circumcise him, and what then? He has done neither good nor evil indeed; but is he in the same state still? No, for now he being circumcis'd, is no longer to be counted common or unclean, but as one of the *Israel*, one of the adopted Children of God; one unto whom belongs the fatness of the Olive Tree; that is, all the blessings promis'd to faithful *Abraham:* May we not now use a sacramental Metonymy, and say, he is regenerated, or in a Covenant way re-established in the Favour of a merciful God? Before he was circumcis'd, (and by that means in God's favour through Covenant) before this, I say, being by the sin of *Adam* put out of God's favour, he was no better than one dead in Trespasses and Sins; but being circumcis'd, he is thereby made a Member of the *Jewish* Church, unto *whom pertaineth the adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promises*, &c. If any Man therefore ask, what advantage had the *Jew?* Or what profit was there in being circumcis'd? I answer with the *Apostle*, Rom. iii. 2. *Much every way*; chiefly because they were by it initiated into the

Jewish

Jewiſh Church, unto whom the Oracles of God were committed; which being premis'd, let us now draw the parallel to our preſent caſe.

As then under the *Jewiſh* œconomy, none were admitted into the *Jewiſh* Church but by Circumciſion: So under the Goſpel Diſpenſation, none can in a regular (that is in a Covenant) way be a viſible Member of the Chriſtian Church but by *Baptiſm:* The *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Church differ in outward form and manner of Adminiſtration; but the ſubſtantial Privileges are the ſame in both, in ſubſtance they differ not. As the *Jew* and *Gentile* have in Subſtance but one Faith, ſo in Subſtance they have but one Church; *built*, as the Apoſtle ſays, *on the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets; Chriſt himſelf being the corner Stone:* The Chriſtian Church (as you may obſerve) is not built on the Apoſtles alone, or on the Prophets alone, but on the Apoſtles and Prophets; and it's obſervable, that the Apoſtle (ſpeaking of the rejection of the *Jews*, and the calling in of the *Gentiles)* ſays, *Rom.* xi. 17. *If ſome of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild Olive Tree*, that is, one that art not a *Jew* born, *wert grafted in among them* (the believing *Jews* that were not broken off) *and with them partakeſt of the root and fatneſs of the Olive Tree:* That is to ſay, if thou art grafted into the ſame Church, and by that means made a partaker with them of the ſubſtantial Bleſſings of the Covenant made with *Abraham* as the Father both of the *Jewiſh* Nation and Church; *boaſt not againſt the branches thus broken off, for they are the natural branches ſtill:* From whence obſerve, it was only ſome of the Branches that were broken off, the Olive Tree was not cut down, neither were all the

Branches broken off, for the wild Olive Branches were grafted into the old Stem, together with the natural Branches that were not broken off; and with them partook of the same Root and Fatness; we see then the *Jewish* and the Christian Church are nourish'd from the same Root; there may be some difference with respect to the manner of being in the Tree, but they are both in it, and both draw Life and Sap from the same Root. If then the initiative Sacrament (Circumcision) under the *Mosaick* Dispensation, could (in one hours time) make such an alteration as is before express'd, without any concurrent Act of the Party circumcis'd: Why may not Baptism, (the only initiative Sacrament) under the Gospel Dispensation, do the same thing? especially if it be true what *Musculus* and others have said concerning this matter. "We shall define Baptism aright, "says he [i], to be the Sacrament of Regenerati- "on, Purgation, Profession, Sanctification, Con- "signment, and Incorporation into Christ our "Saviour: For all those things are wrought by "the Spirit of Christ in the elect and faithful, "of which Baptism is the Sacrament: So that "it may be truly said, that the same is wrought in "it Sacramentally, which is done spiritually by "the Spirit of Christ, either before, at, or after "Baptism is administer'd. And a little after he says with St. *Augustin* in substance thus, that in *Abraham* the Justice or Righteousness of Faith went before, and Circumcision the Sign or Token of it follow'd after: So in *Cornelius* the spiritual Sanctification went before, and the Sacrament of Regeneration (Baptism) came after: But as in *Isaac*,

[i] *In his Common Places*, Fol. p. 282.

Circum-

Circumciſion, the Sign went before the thing ſignify'd; ſo in the Infants who are baptiz'd, the Sacrament of Regeneration goes before; and if they hold on in a Chriſtian godly life, there follows after that Converſion in their Hearts, the Sign of which went before in Baptiſm. Dr. *Willet*, Biſhop *Taylor*, Biſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *Ridley*, and many more, ſay the ſame thing in Subſtance, as I could fully ſhew, were there an occaſion for it. But, as I think, what I have ſaid is a ſufficient anſwer to the beforeſaid Objection; and ſince my deſign is not to inquire after the Truth, but the Antiquity of Doctrines; I ſhall not only omit that, but alſo (in this place) paſs by that part of the exception which relates to *Goſſips* and the *Liturgy*; well kowing I ſhall meet with them again in their proper place. Having diſpatch'd this, I ſay, and, as I think, fairly and clearly ſhewn, (in oppoſition to his ſhameleſs aſſertion) that the Church of *England* does not appoint Baptiſm for Regeneration on the Deed done: But contrarily, that tho' Baptiſm (the only initiatory Sacrament into the Chriſtian Church) may be call'd *Regeneration*, *Titus* iii. 5. and ſo the Party baptiz'd may (by a Sacramental Metonymy) be ſaid to be regenerated; yet ſpiritual Regeneration (of which Baptiſm with Water is the viſible Sign, Seal, or Pledge) is wrought only by the Spirit of God; and that there is no more Phyſical virtue in the Water of Baptiſm to cleanſe the Soul, than there was in the Waters of *Jordan* to heal *Naaman* of his Leproſie. Give me leave then to go on to that which he chiefly intended by the exception; and that which I am chiefly concern'd to anſwer, *viz.* How long has it been a Cuſtom in the Church to baptize Infants? Why truly I think there has been no time ſince

the apoſtolick Age, in which it was not practis'd in the Church.

" He ſays [k] that Biſhop *Taylor* aſſerts, that the " Tradition of baptizing Infants relies on but two " Witneſſes, *Origen* and *Auguſtin*; and the latter " having receiv'd it from the former, it relies " wholly on the ſingle Teſtimony of *Origen*, " which, ſays he, is but a pitiful Argument to " prove a Tradition Apoſtolical; and to the ſame " purpoſe he cites *Vives*, *Grotius*, *Daille* and " others.

As for Biſhop *Taylor*, I muſt confeſs when I ſaw him produc'd as a Witneſs againſt Infants Baptiſm I was ſurpriz'd, well knowing how ſtrenuouſly he has pleaded for it; and in his *Great Exemplar* fills ſeventeen Pages to prove (from the Writings of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Juſtin Martyr*, who all precede *Origen*) that Infants not only were, but ought to be baptiz'd: And in his *Duct. Dub.* [l] ſays, that he ſhall there take it for granted that Infants are to be baptiz'd, becauſe he had elſewhere ſufficiently prov'd it: And as for what he cites out of *Vives*, *Grotius*, and others, I ſhall refer my Reader to Mr. *Wall*'s Hiſtory of Baptiſm [m] for ſatisfaction. Whether thoſe Citations be genuine or not, I will not diſpute; be that as it will, I think they all came into the World too late; and went out of it again too ſoon, to be unexceptionable Judges in this caſe. Sure I am, there appears to be as good Authority in the Writings of the Fathers, to determine the point that Infants were baptiz'd in their time, as there is to demonſtrate what Books are, and what are nor canonical Scripture. If then our *Anabaptiſts* can in a

[k] *Plea*, p. 24. [l] Lib. 2. Chap. 3. *p.* 546. [m] *Pag.* 271.

point

point *De facto*, and of that Importance depend on the Church's Evidence, what Reaſon is there for them to reject it in the other Caſe? Nay, and unleſs they think there is leſs Danger in rejecting (upon their Evidence) ſome Books as *Apocryphal*, which (but for that Reaſon) may not be ſo, and on the ſame Foot, receive others as *Canonical*, than there is in baptizing or not baptizing Infants: For my part I can't ſee, why they ſhould not in point *De jure* too, as readily admit the latter as the former. But thus much only by the way.

However, if we conſider Infants Baptiſm as a publick Fact, I ſuppoſe no Man of Reading can doubt, but it was the current Practice of the primitive Church in the Days of St. *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and *Tertullian*; this being acknowledged by Mr. *Tombs*, Mr. *Blackwood*, Mr. *Stenet*, and Mr. *Gale*, the moſt learned of the *Anabaptiſts* Party which I have yet met with: And it's certain that *Tertullian* (who was the eldeſt of the three) expreſſly ſpeaks of it; not as a thing then in diſpute, but as the common Practice of the Church in his Time: And not to inſiſt on what is produced by Mr. *Wall* and others, out of the Writings of *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Hermes* (which Arguments remain in Subſtance unſhaken, by what Mr. *Gale* ſays to the contrary) not to inſiſt on this, I ſay, the other being more expreſs and clear, and living not above 150 Years diſtance from the Apoſtolick Age; can it be thought that they who were not above two or three removes from the Apoſtles, ſhould not know what was (in point of Fact) the Practice of the Church in their Fathers or Grandfathers Days? Nay farther, if the baptizing of Infants

had

had then been thought so destructive a Practice, as it is now a-days pretended to be; I cannot imagine how it came so soon to prevail in all christian Churches both East and West. Can we suppose that our Saviour Christ who had promised to be with his Church, and unto the end of the World to lead it into all Truth: Can it be thought, I say, that he should so soon be unmindful of his Promise, and suffer the whole christian Church to run into so great an Error as Infants Baptism is now thought to be; and not preserve unto himself one Church as a Monument of ancient Purity? Nay farther yet, if the baptizing of Infants be an Error that crept into the Church at any time since the Apostles Days; it's very strange, (and indeed I think it next to an impossibility) that it should so soon, and so universally obtain in the christian Church, and no *Father* oppose it, or *Council* condemn it, nor Historian take Notice of it as such. Did the christian Church at once agree to admit this supposed Error? Or can it be supposed that this Error had better Fortune than all other popular Errors, to be received without any opposition? Had the Churches err'd, says an ancient Father, they would have varied: Since then they have not in this Point varied, what reason is there to believe they have err'd?

Mr *Gale* indeed tells us[n], he might produce several Instances against Infants Baptism out of *Irenæus*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *&c.* but if he could, why did he not do it? did any Body hinder him? or has any of his Friends saved him

[n] *In his Animadversions on* Wall's *History of Baptism*, p. 514.

the

the Labour? If ſo, why did he not tell us, who they are, that we may know who to apply our ſelves to for better Information? If he could have done what he pretends to; then was the time when he was highly concern'd to have done it; therefore ſince he has not (when it ſo highly concerned him to do it) I'll venture to gueſs at the Reaſon.

But ſays a Friend of mine a Teacher among the Anabaptiſts, and a great Admirer of Mr. *Gale*'s performance; I doubt not, ſays he, but Mr. *Gale* has made out what he pretends to. Why truly I muſt confeſs he does make an Attempt to do ſo; but I'll undertake to ſhew from a Paſſage or or two cited by him for this Purpoſe, (and in which he ſeems to place his chief Confidence) what excellent Proof a Man may find in Antiquity againſt Infants Baptiſm.

The firſt Teſtimony then produced by him, which I ſhall take Notice of, is part of a Letter which was ſent by *Polycrates*, the chief Biſhop in *Aſia*, to *Victor* then Biſhop of *Rome*, concerning the Obſervation of *Eaſter:* who ſays [o], "And I "*Polycrates*, the meaneſt of you all, do retain "the Tradition of my Fathers, of which alſo "I have imitated ſome; for there were ſeven "Biſhops before me, and I am the eighth, which "always have celebrated the Feaſt of *Eaſter* on "that Day, in which the People remove the "Leaven from among them. I therefore (my "Brethren) which have now liv'd threeſcore "and five Years in the Lord, *&c.* Well, what is there in all this againſt Infants Baptiſm? Why firſt Mr. *Gale* obſerved, that although *Polycrates*

[o] *See* Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib. 5. chap. 22.

was

was born of christian Parents, and in all probability the Son of a christian Bishop; yet was he not baptized in his Infancy, but when he was capable to answer for himself; as he (begging the Question) says the Custom of the Church then was: And then to set the better face upon this, he observes, Secondly, that *Polycrates* makes a plain Distinction betwixt his *natural* and *spiritual* Age; and then concludes, he thinks there is no need of proving any part of this: Truly I think so too, if he had the good Fortune to be credited without it. But pray, Sir, why is there no occasion of proving in this Case? Suppose we admit that *Polycrates* was the Son of a christian Bishop, yet pray pardon me, I see no Reason to believe he was not baptized in his Infancy.

But for Argument sake, let us suppose (what this Gentleman takes for granted) that *Polycrates* did intend by those Words *In the Lord*, to divide the Period of his Life into two distinct Conditions; that is to say, from his Birth to his Baptism out of the Lord, though he was born of christian Parents; and from his Baptism to the time of sending this Letter, (which he takes for granted was 65 Years) in the Lord: And indeed we must suppose all this, or else there is nothing in the Distinction. For if he *(Polycrates)* was in the Lord, in a Covenant-way, from his Birth to his Baptism: From whence comes the Distinction of his natural and spiritual Age? taking it therefore for granted, that in the Lord signifies (in Mr. *Gale*'s Sense) a Person baptized, and out of the Lord one unbaptized: Taking this, I say, for granted, I can't see the least appearance of Reason for his Conclusion.

For

For pray tell me, how does it appear that *Polycrates* was at the time of sending this Letter more than 65 Years old? Nay, let him read on, and the Conclusion of this Letter will inform him, that (if there be any thing his Distinction) *Polycrates* was baptized in his Infancy, as say I the Custom of the Church then was. "For "they all know, says he, that I bear not this "grey Hair in vain, but always (mind that) have "had my Conversation in *Christ Jesus*. If then there is any thing in his Distinction, this Instance is so far from being a Proof against, that it really is a Proof for the Antiquity of Infants Baptism: And if Mr. *Gale* or any of his Friends think this Passage favourable to their Cause, I can at any time when they please to demand it, direct them to more of this kind of Proof.

However, we may observe that according to Mr. *Gale*, no Person can be in the Lord unless he be baptized; if then without this we cannot be either in or of Christ's Church, let him tell me when he is at leasure, what Promises of Salvation Christ or his Apostles have made to Persons that are neither in nor of his Church. Let him tell me, did I say: Nay, but I must remember he has done this already! For [p] speaking of the signification of our Saviour's Words to *Nicodemus*, John iii. *Except a Man be born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* By the Kingdom of God in this Place, says he, may well be understood the Church, or Dispensation of the *Messias*, *&c.* into which he allows none can regularly enter but by Baptism: Well then, as in the Ministry, so also in Baptism, if any come not in by the

[p] *Reflections on* Wall's *History*, p. 411.

Door

Door, that is to say, by the regular Way of God's appointment, but climbs in some other irregular Way, he is a Thief and a Robber. So then Mr. *Gale*, in denying Baptism to Infants, shuts them out, or excludes them from being Members of the visible Church; how then will he get them admittance into the Church Triumphant? especially considering he tells us [q], "That "the Church Triumphant is built out of the Church "Militant: Can they then make a part of the one, who have not first been united to the other? "If the primitive Church thought, says he, "that none could be saved without Baptism, there "is no doubt, but the tenderness of the first Chri-"stians, prevailed on them to baptize their Chil-"dren: And pray give me leave (in a Covenant-way) did they not think so? Then it cannot be doubted, says Mr. *Gale*, but they baptized their Children! Well then, let us go on, and

Secondly, Let us view a Passage cited by him out of St. *Barnabas* [r], who (speaking of the Milk and Honey which were wont to be given to the Baptiz'd) says, "That as the Child is nou-"rished, first with Honey, and then with Milk; "so we being strengthened, and being kept alive "with the belief of his Promises and the Word, "shall live, *&c.* From which I suppose he would have us infer (and indeed according to him we must infer much.) First, that Milk and Honey were then given to all the Baptiz'd; And Secondly, that they were not then given to Infants, and therefore that Infants were not then baptiz'd. Well,

But if I may be so free, pray how does it appear in the first Place; that Milk and Honey

[q] *Reflect.* p. 405. [r] P. 400.

were

were then given to all the Baptiz'd; But suppose they were, yet how does it appear that they were not then given to Children? Does not St. *Barnabas*, at least plainly intimate that they were, when he says, that as the Child is nourished first with Honey, and then with Milk, *&c.* If Honey and Milk were not then given to them, how could they be nourish'd by them? Without his Assistance I must confess I cannot make this out.

For if in the primitive Church, Milk and Honey were given to Infants, as well as to the Adult; I would gladly know how this Argument can be supported? In the primitive Church Milk and Honey were given to the Adult; *ergo*, in the primitive Church Infants were not baptized. Excellent Logick! What Infants in the Conclusion, and no Infants in the Antecedent? If I may argue without the exclusive Particle only; I might as well conclude from the before-said Premisses, that none but Infants were then baptiz'd. For I might retort the Argument thus; in the primitive Church Milk and Honey were wont to be given to the Baptiz'd; but in the primitive Church Milk and Honey were given to Children; *ergo*, in the primitive Church no adult Persons were baptized. I might make the like Observation on what is cited by him [f] from the very ancient *Nizzachon* he there speaks of: Which indeed is a plain Proof for the Antiquity of Infants Baptism; or it is ill produced against the Custom of baptizing among the *Jews*. The same may be said with respect to several other Passages referr'd to by him in the before-said Book: But my proposed Me-

[f] *Reflect.* p. 330, 331.

thod

thod forbids me this, and obliges me, to return to *De Launc*, who [r] acknowledges, that it was a Cuſtom in the primitive Church to give the Euchariſt to Infants from the third to the twelfth Century: And if ſo, ſure they baptized them firſt! Taking it therefore for granted, that Infants were baptized in the primitive Church: Give me leave, in this point in which I am chiefly concerned; having my ſelf been brought up an Anabaptiſt: Give me leave, I ſay, in ſhort, to ſum up the Evidence for Infants Baptiſm, not only in point *De facto*, but *De jure* too: And in doing of which, I ſhall give (in Subſtance) my Reaſons, why I left the Anabaptiſts and joyn'd with the truly apoſtolick Church of *England*.

Firſt, Then it has been proved to me paſt all reply, that Infants were admitted into the *Jewiſh* Church as Members of the ſame, by the then ſacramental Sign or Seal of Circumciſion.

Secondly, That the *Jewiſh* and chriſtian Church are in Subſtance the ſame: And as in the *Jewiſh* Church, none could (in a Covenant-way) be admitted into it, but by Circumciſion the Seal of the Covenant and Badge of the Church. So under the Goſpel Diſpenſation none can in a regular way (as Mr. *Gale* well obſerves) be admitted into the chriſtian Church but by Baptiſm, the Goſpel Seal of the ſame Covenant, and Badge of the chriſtian Church.

Thirdly, That Infants Church-Membership was a ſubſtantial Privilege of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and of the *Jewiſh* Church which was founded on it.

---

[r] *Plea*, p. 34.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, That Christ by his coming, did not intend to take away any substantial Privilege which his Church enjoy'd before, but to enlarge them.

Fifthly, That the Alteration of the initiative Sign, makes no more Alteration in the thing signed or sealed by it, than a change of the Bread in the other Sacrament from unleavened to leavened, will argue it not to be the same Sacrament. Or a Man may as well argue, that a circumstantial Alteration in the Broad Seal of *England* from what it was 500 years ago, argues it to be not the same Seal, and that a Patent formerly granted under it; is not now under the Broad Seal of *England*.

Sixthly, That by an equitable Interpretation of many New Testament Texts; it appears, that Infants have now (under the Gospel Dispensation) the same Privileges continued to them, that they had under the *Mosaick* Dispensation; and therefore there is now, the same equitable Reasons to be given for their Baptism, that there then was for their Circumcision.

Seventhly, That in the *Jewish* Church before our Saviour's time, Children and Strangers were baptized as well as circumcised. Therefore,

Eighthly, Since this was a known Custom in the *Jewish* Church, and since our Saviour was pleased to perpetuate this Custom, as the standing initiative Sacrament of the christian Church: It is highly to be presumed, if our Saviour had not approved their Practice with respect to the Subject, as well as the Ceremony of Baptism, he would never have introduced the one, and not at the same time express his dislike of the other. Especially if we consider that our Saviour and

his Apoſtles introduced as much of *Judaiſm* into the chriſtian Religion, as the nature of the Reformation would well bear; as any may ſee fully made out, in a Piece called the *Chriſtian Synagogue*. And then,

Ninthly, If we add this Conſideration to thoſe before mentioned; that is to ſay, if we conſider, that (for what yet appears to the contrary) it has ever (till of late) been the Practice of the chriſtian Church to baptize their Children: I think, I ſay, all theſe things conſider'd, amounts to a Proof ſo demonſtrative that Infants have right to Baptiſm; that for my part I muſt confeſs, I have never yet ſeen any ſufficient Arguments produc'd by others, neither can I frame any to my ſelf ſo ponderous, as to weigh down what I have here produced for it; as I could fully ſhew, by a Confirmation of the aforeſaid Particulars, if my propoſed Method did not oblige me to omit this. To go on then, he tells us,

Sixthly, "That as for the *Liturgy*, it's ano-
"ther thing than can be found among the An-
"cients: Is it not clear, ſays he [u], that in the
"third Century, they had no *Directory* or Book to
"pray by, as *Tertullian* in his Apology mentions?
I anſwer, no, it is not, but quite the contrary, as is fully proved by Dr. *Comber* in his Hiſtory of *Liturgies*, and by the Author of the fifth Caſe in the ſecond Volume of the *London Caſes*, as alſo by Mr. *Pellen* in his *Good old Way*; and many more that I could name if there were an Occaſion, unto which Books I refer the Reader for full Satisfaction. There they will find all thoſe Paſſages cited by *De Laune* (in his Favour) out

[u] P. 27.

of

of *Tertullian*, *&c.* fairly reply'd to and confuted. And as for his fooliſh Story about *Gregory*'s and *Ambroſe*'s Maſs; I can afford it (as it deſerves) no other Anſwer than a Smile.

But he goes on, and in the next Place tells us, that *Platina* ſays, the Litanies or Supplications were ordained by *Gregory* the firſt: But this is a great Miſtake as the Reader may plainly ſee, if he will give himſelf the trouble of conſulting *Mr. Pellen*'s *Good old Way* [w]. "The Collects "ordinary were ordained by Pope *Gregory*, he "made the Nights and Days *Antiphones*, or Sing-"ing-ſervice, ſays he [x]. Well, who could expect to meet with ſuch Arguments in a Book ſo much applauded by a Party, as an unanſwerable and finiſhed Piece? Suppoſe I ſhould ask Mr. *De Foe*, what he has to ſay againſt the Collects ordinary and the Antiphones? Why truly he ſays [y], he can make no better reply than this, *Gregory* ordained this, *Gregory* brought in that! excellent Logick! Sure I am, *Socrates* expreſſly ſays [z], "That "the Hymns commonly called Antiphons that "were ſung interchangeably in the Church, had "their Original from *Ignatius* Biſhop of *Antioch* "in *Syria*, the third Biſhop by Succeſſion from "*Peter* the Apoſtle, *&c.* And thoſe that will give themſelves the trouble of conſulting Dr. *Cave*'s primitive Chriſtianity [a], and the before-cited Book of Mr. *Pellen*'s, will find that there was a Singing-ſervice uſed in the Church long before *Gregory*'s Days. Let them likewiſe conſult *Euſebius* [b], and they may ſee reaſon to conclude,

---

[w] P. 99. [x] *Plea*, pag. 30. [y] *Preface to* De Launne's *Plea*, p. 15. [z] *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* lib. 6. cap. 8. [a] Part 1. chap. 9. [b] *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* lib. 7. cap. 8.

that there was a Singing-ſervice in the Church of *Alexandria*, in the Days of *Dionyſius* Biſhop of that See, who was near 300 Years *Gregory*'s Senior.

As for the Epiſtles and Goſpels, they are the very Words of Scripture, and I hope they intend not to perſuade us that it's a Crime to read that! And as for the Collects, they are indeed ſhort, but yet very ſound Prayers perfectly agreeable to the analogy of Faith, and expreſſive of much Piety and Devotion; for my part I cannot ſee what Crime it can be to uſe them, let who will firſt appoint them. To proceed then,

He in the next Place tells us, the primitive Church had no Altars: But pray how does this appear? He ſays, that *Sylveſter Anno* 334. was the firſt Author of their Conſecration: But it does not from thence follow, that they were not before. Sure I am, there is good Reaſons to believe they were in uſe long before; but if they were not, let it be remember'd what *De Laune* was to prove, *viz.* that the Church of *England* in the uſe of her Rites and Ceremonies, went contrary to the Practice of the primitive Church in the firſt four hundred Years after Chriſt: In order to which, he produces this Inſtance, which comes within the Compaſs of the firſt four hundred Years, which was the time by him fixed for pure Antiquity; and conſequently this Inſtance is produced contradictory to his Principle, and ſo there is an end of that. Well,

He goes on however, and ſays [c], "That neither the Apoſtles, or any apoſtolick Men, "have given us any Law for the Obſervation of

[c] *Plea*, p. 30.

Eaſter,

" *Easter*, or any other Feast whatsoever. Well, what of that? Our Question is not *De jure*; and we are assur'd from *Euseb.* [d] and others, that in point *De facto*, if not *De jure*, the primitive Church did observe, not only the Feast of *Easter*, but several others. " And in short, says Bishop " *Hacket* [e], the Feast of *Easter*, *Whitsontide*, " *Christmas*, the *Passion* Day and *Ascension*, were " most anciently kept before *Constantine*'s Reign, " when the Church was under Persecution, and " had no leisure to invent superfluity of Cere- " monies. Nay, *Polycrates* (in the before cited place of *Eusebius)* after having counted up several of the *Asian* Bishops who had observed the same Custom with himself in keeping of *Easter*, as *Philip* and *John* the Apostles, *Polycarpus*, *Thrateas*, *Papyrius*, *Melito*, &c. after having mention'd those, I say, he concludes thus: " All " these celebrated the Feast of *Easter* according " unto the Gospel, in the fourteenth Moon, " swerving no where, but observing the Rule " of Faith, *&c.* Here then is a Rule of Faith for it, back'd with the Practice of *Philip* and *John* the Apostles, and all the *Asian* Bishops. However, I shall not concern my self with the Argument *De jure*, that being remote from our present Question; but confining my self to the Argument *De facto*, shall not doubt to affirm, that it was observ'd by (at least) some of the Apostles themselves. To proceed then, he tells us that,

---

[d] Eccles. Hist. *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 22. *and* Cave's Primit. Christ. *Part.* 1. *Chap.* 7.

[e] *In his Sermon on the Church Festivals.*

" As for Eccleſiaſtical Orders and Officers of " *Lord Archbiſhop*, *Lord Biſhops*, *Deans*, *Arch-* " *deacons*, &c. and the Supremacy exercis'd one " over another in the Church of *England*; they " are ſo far from having the Stamp of primitive " Antiquity, that they are not to be found " therein, at leaſt for the three or four firſt " Centuries. Well, I will not diſpute with him about Names and Titles, but level my Argument againſt what he intended by the Objection; which was, to poſſeſs his Reader with an opinion, that the primitive Church was not (as ours now is) governed by Biſhops; which in truth was a deceiving of him; for all that have read over the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, and *Cyprian*, or have been the leaſt converſant in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, muſt know, that the primitive Church was govern'd by Biſhops, from the very firſt plantation of Chriſtian Churches in the World.

I am not inſenſible, that this is oppos'd by very many, who ſay, that this cannot be prov'd from the Authority of Scripture: Should we, which we by no means do, grant this, what would follow? Why then, ſay they, it was not ſo from the beginning; but pray why ſo? Are no Truths ſparingly ſet down in the New Teſtament? Well, but ſay they, a Biſhop and a Presbyter, in the Scripture Language, ſignifies one and the ſame thing. I told my Reader before, that I would not diſpute about words; tho' it's certain, they may as ſoon prove Prince *Eugene* to be Emperor of *Germany*, as make out this aſſertion. Let us then bring the matter to a point of Fact; and then I ſhall argue on it thus: Either

ther Christ or his Apostles did institute a Form of Church Government, or they did not; if not, then Church Government is left as a thing in it self indifferent, and consequently, every national Church may appoint what Form of Government they think fit; and if so, no Man I think can shew a reason, why he should separate from the Church of *England* on this account. Nay farther, if this Supposition be admitted, it will effectually overthrow their pretended divine Original, of Presbyterian Church Government. But if on the other hand, Christ or his Apostles did institute a Form of Church Government, then I think it could be no other than an Episcopal Form: For had they settled any other Form, that, whatever it is suppos'd to be, must necessarily be laid aside, before Episcopacy could take place. Well then, if we consider Church Government as a publick thing, in which all are concern'd more or less; and if we likewise consider it as a plain matter of Fact, that the Churches of *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, *Rome*, *Alexandria*, &c. were all govern'd by Bishops in the very next Age to the Apostles, nay in the Apostles days: When we consider this, I say, how can we suppose it possible, that such a change of Government could happen, and no Historian of those Times take any notice of it? Nay, if Episcopacy was not the primitive Form; how can we suppose that those who before govern'd the Churches, should tamely submit themselves to be outed by the Bishops, and the whole Frame of Government overturn'd by a few ambitious Men, and yet not say one word against it; or in the least complain of the Injury? Sure they were very moderate, or very careless Presbyterians in those Days! what, suffer the Church of Christ to be so impos'd on,

and not in the leaſt oppoſe ſuch bold innovations? Very ſtrange! Add, that the extraordinary Gifts and Graces of the Spirit were not yet ceaſed from among the Governors of Chriſt's Church; and ſure God Almighty would not by Signs and Miracles have confirm'd the uſurp'd Authority of Biſhops, pretending a Miſſion from him, which they had never receiv'd.

Well then, for a concluſion of this Point I ſhall add, if Epiſcopal Government were not the primitive Form, let the Diſſenter tell me when and how the change was made; if they cannot do this, let them name me any one Church ſince the Apoſtles, to *Calvin*'s time, that was not ſo govern'd; if it had in it any ſettl'd Form of Government. And if Presbyterian Church Government were the primitive Form, it's very hard if they can't name one Church compleatly ſettl'd, that was ſo govern'd before *Calvin*'s Days.

To proceed then, he in the next place tells us, the primitive Fathers were againſt dedicating Churches to Saints and Angels, *&c.* and pray who is for it? Whom does he prove guilty? Well, go on then.

And now he tells us, Pope *Vitellianus* brought *Organs* and other muſical Inſtruments into the Church about the eighth Century; Pope *Zacharias* ordain'd Prieſts, Gowns, Tippets, and four-corner'd Caps, *&c.* Can any Man of Reaſon think this worth an Anſwer?

The *Wedneſday*, *Friday*, and *Saturdays* Faſts, were ordain'd by Pope *Boniface*, ſays he; but ſuppoſe this were really true, (as in truth it is not) is it impoſſible to make a good uſe of any thing that *Boniface* ordained? Nay, but where are theſe faſting days obſerved?

But

But now for a concluſion he tells us, the Apoſtles Creed (as it now ſtands in our Liturgy) was unknown in the primitive Time; for, ſays he, the Fathers who give us an account of the ancient Creed, do all give it us in a different Form. Well, a form it ſeems they had however; and what if that and this differ in *Form*, ſo long as they agree in Subſtance; where is the fault? Is he now minded to change ſides and plead *for*, who has all along been pleading *againſt* Forms? I think it's plain from *Rom.* vi. 17. 2 *Tim.* i. 13. *Galat.* vi. 16. 1 *Tim.* vi. 20. *Acts* xvi. 4. and St. *Jude* 3. that the primitive Church had a form of Faith; and if we may believe Dr. *Comber*, Biſhop *Taylor*, &c. it was that which we now call the *Apoſtles Creed*; but whether it were or not, I think Prudence will direct us to keep to this, till ſome body will ſhew us a better.

Thus have I taken a view of the ſeveral Particulars, in which (as he ſays) the Church of *England* goes contrary to the primitive Pattern. But in truth this is but a pretence; for upon an impartial Examination of the matter, I find that the Church of *England*, in the uſe of her Rites and Ceremonies, does agree with the primitive Church in moſt of them. And as for the obſervation that the *Proteſtant Reconciler* makes on the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, I think I may paſs by it here, having (at the beginning of this particular) given a virtual Anſwer to it. Therefore, without detaining my Reader any longer on this point, I ſhall go on, and according to my propos'd method,

Sixthly and *laſtly*, Inquire, whether it is any Crime in the Church of *England*, to ſymbolize (ſo far as it doth) with the Church of *Rome*.

Now

Now we muſt conſider the Church of *Rome*, either as a pure, or corrupt Church; or as being partly pure, and partly corrupt: If ſhe is a pure one, then it can be no Sin to agree with her: If ſhe is a corrupt Church, then indeed it is a Duty not to agree with her; but if ſhe is in part pure, and in part corrupt; why then, as it is no Crime to differ from her in thoſe things wherein ſhe is corrupted; ſo neither can it be any to agree with her in that part, in which ſhe yet remains uncorrupt.

Suppoſe a Man were to ſpeak or write againſt the Church of *Rome*; would he condemn all and every thing he finds therein? God forbid! *Wilt thou deſtroy the righteous with the wicked?* ſays *Abraham*, Gen. xviii. 23. So ſay I, peradventure there ſhould be found in that Church, fifty, forty, thirty, twenty, or ten good things, ſhall they be condemned for lack of five? God forbid! the ſeven Churches of *Aſia* had in them ſome things for which (as St. *John* ſays) the Lord was againſt them; but they had alſo ſome other things in them, for which they were commended by him: Sure then, it could be no Sin to imitate any of thoſe Churches in the latter, the Fault was in imitating them in the former; the caſe is the ſame with reſpect to the Church of *Rome*: It's no Fault to agree with her in what ſhe does well, the Fault is in agreeing with her in what ſhe does ill: They that make it the meaſure of their Religion, to be as unlike the Church of *Rome* as they can; and think themſelves ſo much the more pure, by how much the greater diſtance they are remov'd from her; ſuch Men, I ſay, had need take care they do not purſue this notion ſo far as ſome in *Poland* are

are said to have done, and under a pretence of Zeal against Superstition and Popery, have condemned the Doctrine of the Trinity as such. "We may truly say, says Mr. *Hooker* [f], that in "Doctrine, in Discipline, in Prayers, and in "Sacraments, the Church of *Rome* hath very "foul and gross Corruptions: But then, says he, "we must not make her more guilty than she "really is; we must not call that a Corruption, "which is really a Virtue in her, no more than "we may call that a Virtue, which is really a "Corruption. If a Man would go about to re-"form the Church of *Rome*, ought he not first "to make a distinction, what are the things "that need reforming, from those that need it "not? lest instead of a Reformation, he make "a Deformation. Thus far he. From the whole of the matter I conclude, it's no Crime simply to symbolize with the Church of *Rome*; the Fault is only in symbolizing with her in what she does amiss.

"But most of the Reformed hold, says he [g], "that those Laws we have alledg'd out of the "Old Testament against the Monuments of I-"dolatry, such as *Jer.* li. 26. *Levit.* xix. 19. "*Zeph.* i. 5. bind us as much as they did the "*Jews:* From whence he concludes, that all the Relicks of popish and heathenish Superstition, are to be banish'd out of the Church of Christ. Well, with all my heart let them go; but this I think is certain, the Texts he has

---

[f] Eccles. Pol. *Lib.* 4. *Pag.* 105.
[g] *Plea*, p. 75.

alledg'd

alledg'd for this purpoſe, will never prove the thing for which he brings them.

For, if in point of Fact it can be made appear, that the *Jews*, as well as Chriſtians, have us'd ſome things (of an indifferent Nature) in the Worſhip of God, tho' they have been us'd in idolatrous Worſhip; then whatever the meaning of thoſe Texts is, the Superſtructure which *De Laune* intended to erect thereon, muſt inevitably fall to the Ground.

I remember the *Aſſembly* of *Divines* in their *larger Catechiſm* [h], lay it down as a Maxim to be obſerv'd in expounding the Ten Commandments; that wherever any Duty is commanded, there the contrary Sin is forbid; and where any Sin is forbid, there the contrary Virtue is commanded: Well then, in view of this Maxim let us go on, and as we go, let us remember that we are forbid to fall down to any falſe Gods [i]: If we may not fall or bow down to a falſe, according to the Aſſembly's beforeſaid Maxim, we are bound to bow down to the true God: But has not that Poſture been abus'd to idolatrous Purpoſes? There's no doubt to be made of that [k]! notwithſtanding this abuſe, the ſame Ceremony has been commendably us'd in the Worſhip of God, as appears from *Ezra* ix. 5. *Acts* xx. 36.

Again, there was a ceremonial Kiſs us'd by the worſhippers of *Baal*, as appears from 1 *Kings* xix. 18. But notwithſtanding this abuſe, the primitive Chriſtian Church made frequent uſe of

---

[h] P. 106. [i] *Exod.* xx. 5.
[k] 1 *Kings* xix. 18. *Iſa.* ii. 9.

it,

it, as appears from 1 *Theſſ.* v. 26. 1 *Pet.* v. 14. *Rom.* xvi. 16. I might make the like Obſervations in ſome other Particulars; but as I think what I have ſaid ſufficient, I ſhall not trouble either my Reader or my ſelf with more inſtances to confirm this Point.

Well, but, ſays he, we are forbid to take of the *Babyloniſh* Materials; not ſo much as a Corner or a Foundation Stone it ſeems may be taken from thence: But againſt him I will (in this point) ſet the Authority of the Aſſembly of Divines; who in their Appendix to the *Directory* aſſert, "That as no Place is capable of any ho-"lineſs, under pretence of whatſoever dedicati-"on or conſecration; ſo neither is it ſubject to "ſuch pollution, by any Superſtition formerly "us'd, and now laid aſide, as may render it un-"lawful or inconvenient, for Chriſtians to meet "together therein for the publick Worſhip of "God. And therefore we hold it requiſite, "ſay they, that the places of publick aſſembling "for Worſhip among us, ſhould be continued "and employed to that uſe. We ſee then, the *Aſſembly* gives liberty to take the whole Building; and if we may without offence take the whole, ſure it can be no crime to take a part. Nay, if we may without offence take the Houſe, what fault can there be in taking the Goods too? He that argues againſt a thing becauſe it's *abus'd*, does tacitly confeſs there may be a lawful uſe of it: To ſay I may not do this or that thing becauſe the Church of *Rome*, or the great *Turk* does ſo, is ridiculous, unleſs it could be made out that they do nothing that is good: Which being premis'd, let us now go on to make ſome Obſervations on what *De Laune* ſays, with re-

ſpect to our ſymbolizing with the Church of *Rome*.

Firſt then, he tells us[l], "That the Service "of the Church of *England* is the ſame in the "main Body and Eſſentials, chiefeſt Materials, "Frame and Order with that of the popiſh; "as that our Collects, Mattins, Even-ſongs, "Epiſtles, Goſpels, Creeds, *&c.* are all taken out "of their Breviary, Ritual, Miſſal, and Pontifi-"cal, *&c.* and then to ſet the better Gloſs on the Matter, he tells his Reader, that we ſymbolize with the Church of *Rome*: "Firſt, with reſpect "to the Time in which our divine Service is to "be performed. Secondly, in the divine Ser-"vice it ſelf which is to be performed. Third-"ly in the Rites and Ceremonies performed in "divine Service.

With reſpect to the firſt, he ſays, "Their "Breviary and Kalendar divide the Year into "Feaſts, Vigils, Faſts and Working-days: So "do we take ours from them, dividing our Ka-"lendar by theirs, *&c.* It's true, ſays he, they "have more than we, but all ours are found in "theirs, *&c.* What all, Sir, without Exception? No! I'll warrant you a Man may ſearch in thoſe Books till he is blind, and not find the good Saint, King *Charles*'s Martyrdom there: And I dare be anſwerable for it, he may as ſoon find this as the *Gunpowder-Treaſon* Feſtival on the Fifth of *November*, or that of the Reſtauration on the Twenty-ninth of *May*. Therefore, if any Man ask us *De Laune*'s Queſtion, *pag.* 41. who has required thoſe Days at our Hands? We

---

[l] *Plea*, p. 37. [m] *Plea*, p. 38.

cannot

cannot anſwer without lying (as he ſays we muſt) our Sovereign Lord the Pope! No, if he were once our Sovereign Lord as *De Laune* calls him, I'll warrant you he would ſoon require (as the Diſſenters do) theſe to be blotted out of our Kalendar. However, if the *Jews* could without Offence appoint Feaſts to perpetuate to Poſterity the Memory of their Deliverances: I ſee no reaſon why we have not as much reaſon to keep up the Memory of thoſe Days, though they are not to be found in the *Pope*'s, any more than in the *Diſſenter's Kalendar*, But,

What though the Papiſts and we obſerve the Feaſts of *Eaſter*, *Chriſtmas*, *&c.* at one and the ſame time? Is there any Fault in that? If thoſe Feaſts may be obſerved at any Time, why not at this? For, either the Time on which we obſerve them is proper or improper; if it is an improper Time, why do they not publiſh a Proteſt againſt the primitive Church who fix'd it ſo: If it is obſerv'd in a proper Time, why may not the Churches of *England* and *Rome*, be allowed to do things in a proper Seaſon?

De Laune, I muſt confeſs, makes a great flouriſh upon this Argument that reſpects the Time of Worſhip: But in Truth, if we come to a ſtrict Examination of the Matter, we ſhall find it to be no more than flouriſh; at moſt it was only a deceptive way of arguing, to deceive the Ignorant, or fright the ſuperſtitiouſly Fearful: For ſure none but ſuch can be prevailed on by thoſe kind of Arguments.

I remember a Story which *Peter Du Moulin* tells[n], of one *Ziſca* a *Bohemian* Gentlemen, who

[n] *In his Anatomy of the Maſs*, p. 341.

(by repeated Victories obtained over the *Hungarians* and *Germans*,) had render'd his very Name so terrible to them, that the Emperor *Sigismond* fearing the ill Consequence that might attend such a panick Fear, and withal himself dispairing to conquer him by the Sword; at last sent to *Zisca*, and makes him large Offers of Preferment, if he would come in and joyn with the Emperor: *Zisca* gave ear to that, says *Du Moulin*, and took his Journey to meet the Emperor, but he fell sick and died by the Way, being very old and blind. *Æneas Sylvius* says, that when he was a dying he gave Counsel to his People, to take off his Skin (when he was dead) and make a Drum of it, assuring them that his and their Enemies would not fail to run away at the sound of that Drum, which accordingly was done and had the intended Effect; for their Enemies believing that this Drum was inchanted, as well as the Man of whose Skin it was made, run all away at the sound of it, as if they had been Thunderstruck: And much after the same manner are some Men affected with the Words *Popery* and *Superstition*. What if *De Laune* or *De Foe*, or any other designing Party-man, have a mind to disgrace any thing that their Adversary does in matters of Religion: Why, let them beat the Drum, and give the Word *Popery*, and their Followers are ready at the sound thereof (as of those the Prophet *Daniel* speaks of[o], to fall down and worship the golden Image that those *Nebuchadnezzars* set up. Have they a design against Forms of Prayer? Why call it *Popery!* Is it the Observation of some Days that offends them?

[o] Chap. 3, 7.

That's

That's nothing less than *Superstition!* Does *kneeling* at the *Sacrament*, the *Cross* after *Baptism*, the *baptizing* of *Infants*, *&c.* displease them? Why *Popery* still is the Word! thus have they under a Pretence of avoiding Superstition run themselves into it.

But suppose the Knave by this Trick should gain a foolish Proselyte or two, what Thanks has he for so doing? *He that begets a foolish Son does it to his own Sorrow; and the Father of such a Fool has no joy*, says *Solomon* P. To conclude this Point then; if the *Jews* under the Law did without blame (as well as without a Command from God) observe the Feasts of *Purim* and *Dedication*: And if the *Pharisees* had (without reproof from God for having them) their *weekly Fasts*, *Luke* xviii. 12. and in a Word, if the *primitive Church* had (as no doubt but they had) their *anniversary Feasts*, *&c.* then I can see no reason why we should be counted *superstitious*, for doing what they did *blamelessly*. And thus much for the Time in which the divine Service is to be performed. But then,

Secondly, "We symbolize with them, says he, "in the divine Service it self which is to be "performed. For, says he, the Substance or "Matter of their divine Service consists in *Col-* "*lects* or *short Prayers*, *Confessions*, *Absolutions*, "*prescript Lessons*, in *Psalms*, *Epistles*, *Gospels*, "*Prophets*, *Apocrypha*, *Litanies*, *Anthems*, &c. "all which is the Substance or Matter of our di- "vine Service, in all parts of it appropriated "and apply'd to the several and respective Of- "fices of *Baptism*, the *Lord's-Supper*, *Marri-*

P *Prov.* 17. 21.

" *age, &c.* What? then their Service and ours, it seems, is the very same in all respects! No, not so neither; for he immediately adds, " It's true, " there may be some *Variation* in the *Collects* " and *Lessons*, *Litanies* and *Anthems*, *&c.* But since he speaks so very doubtfully in the matter, I know not how to thank him, for making such a Confession as is not to be depended on: However, though he would not, yet I will say, the thing is true without a may be; for there certainly are many and great *Variations* in the *Collects*, *Lessons*, *Litanies* and *Anthems*; and not only in them, but in *all* the before-said *Offices*.

However, I will not now insist on some few Variations, that as he says, may be, and which I say certainly are betwixt the divine Services used in the Churches of *England* and *Rome*: Not to insist on that, I say, he says, the *Substance* or *Matter* of our *divine Service*, is contained in those *Collects*, *Lessons*, *Litanies*, *Anthems*, *short Prayers*, *&c.* Well, the *Substance* of the *English* Service is contain'd in those *short Prayers*, *Collects*, *Lessons*, *&c.* and they being contained in the *Scripture*, the Consequence is, the *Substance* of the *English Service* is contained in the Scripture; and is not that a terrible thing?

He says, we symbolize with *Rome* in using *short Prayers*; But if we should use long ones, we should symbolize with the *Pharisees*, who (as our Saviour says) devoured Widows Houses, and for a Pretence made *long Prayers:* Which is it then safest to symbolize with? The latter being a Generation of Vipers, as well as the former!

As for the Epistles, Gospels, Lessons, and Psalms, they are the very Word of God; and to deny People the use of that, because the Church

Church of *Rome* uſes it, is not far from a *popiſh Tenet*. And then,

As for the Litanies, Anthems or Canticles, *&c.* they are either compoſed of Scripture words, or contain ſuch Matter as is agreeable thereto: And what ſhould make it a Fault to uſe ſuch Prayers, for my part I know not.

De Laune, I muſt confeſs, gives nine Reaſons againſt the uſe of them, which (being too tedious to repeat) I ſhall reduce the Subſtance of them under theſe two Conſiderations: Firſt, becauſe of the *Abuſes* that is in the *Matter*; and Secondly, in the *Manner* of them.

With reſpect to the former, he ſays, the *Epiſtles*, *Goſpels* and *Pſalms*, are taken out of the *vulgar Latin* Bible, and ſo (as he inſinuates) the Expreſſions uſed therein are corrupt. Well, be it ſo, he that ſays a thing is abuſed, does confeſs the ſame may be lawfully uſed, and conſequently this can be no Argument againſt the uſe, but only for the removal of thoſe *Abuſes*. However, the Abuſes I hope are not great or many; and thoſe few that are, may be generally known and avoided without ſeparating from the Church: For that is not the beſt way to reform things amiſs, but rather to make thoſe things amiſs that were well before. If a Man were diſtemper'd in his Body, would it commend the Phyſicians Skill, to kill the Man in order to cure the Diſtemper? No more are they to be commended, who ſeparate from a pure Church, on account of ſome ſmall circumſtantial Miſtakes; eſpecially conſidering, it is not in the Power of every private Man to determine what is amiſs in the Church, much leſs to reform it; and though I approve not of an *implicite Faith*, yet I think there

ought to be a due reſpect paid to the Determinations of our Superiors in thoſe things, which concern not the Fundamentals of Religion. And if in this Caſe, there ſhould be ſome things appointed by them, which do not in all reſpects ſquare with our Judgments, we may in a friendly and peaceable way expreſs our diſlike, and in a legal way endeavour the removal of them: And if in this we ſhould prove inſucceſsful, yet we may (by keeping our Judgments free) preſerve our own Innocence, the Church's Peace, and not ſeparate from her. But then,

Secondly, He diſlikes our *Epiſtles* and *Goſpels*, *&c.* becauſe they are uſed after our manner, by curtailing and mangling the Scripture, and ruining the Scope and Connexion of it in divers Places; as likewiſe becauſe they have been the Invention of the *Pope*, from whom, as he ſays, we had them, *&c.* Well ſuppoſe we had them from the *Pope*, what are they the worſe for that? How fooliſh and ridiculous is it to hear Men argue againſt the *uſe* of this or that thing, becauſe forſooth the *Pope* uſes it, as if it were a Crime to have or hold any thing in common with the *Pope*. Suppoſe then the *Pope* believes in God and his Son Chriſt, ſays his Prayers, reads the Scripture, and in all reſpects acts as an honeſt Man ought to do; ſuppoſing this, I ſay, is it then any Crime, nay, is it not rather the Duty of every honeſt Man to imitate him? Can any Man of Senſe be ſo far given up as to think it a ſufficient Exception againſt this or that thing, to ſay this is done by the *Pope?* Or that is found in his Kalendar? Alas, no, this will not do! For, ſince he does, and there is to be found in his Kalendar both good, as well as bad things:

They

They must prove that the things excepted against are to be counted among the latter, or their Argument is produced to no Purpose.

As for ruining the Scope and Connexion of the Scripture, I am as much against it as he or any Man living: But why he should make this an Exception against the *use* of our *Epistles* and *Gospels*, I must confess I know not.

For admitting we did, or do use some Scripture Expressions in our Service, without a strict regard had to the Scope and Connexion of them; yet I cannot see, how this can make us guilty of the Crime, of which we are accused by *De Laune*.

For I conceive, there is a great and wide Difference, betwixt citing Scripture for the confirmation of a doctrinal Point, and using such Portions of Scripture in our Prayers as fitly express our Desires: In the former, a principal respect is to be had to the Scope and Connexion of the Place cited or referred to; but in the latter we are not ty'd to this Rule, but only to have an eye to the aptitude or fitness of Expression, that is in the Texts for our present Purpose; and this is no more than what is frequently practis'd by the Dissenters themselves; therefore if this Argument have any force against us, it has as much against them; and consequently this can be no reason, why I should forsake the Church of *England*, and again joyn with them. But then,

Thirdly, We symbolize with the *Church* of *Rome*, says he [9], in our *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of Worship; for do they *kneel* at *Confession*, *Absolution*, *Pater-noster*, &c.? So do we. Do they

[9] *Plea*, p. 42.

ſit at reading the *Leſſons*, *ſtand* and repeat the *Creed*, &c.? So do we. That is as much as to ſay in ſhort, do they *kneel* when they pray to God? Do they *ſtand* when they confeſs or praiſe God? So do we, and ſo it becomes us well to do, for ſo did the Primitive Church. But what if they did not? kneeling, ſitting, and ſtanding, are all Circumſtantials of Worſhip, which God has left undetermin'd, and are ſo far only neceſſary, as they are (by the appointment of the Church) made ſubſervient to the decent and orderly performance of the publick Worſhip of God. If then the publick Worſhip of God be decently and orderly perform'd in the *Church* of *Rome*; why may not the *Church* of *England* ſymbolize with her in what ſhe does well? Nay, why ſhould we (under a pretence of being as unlike the Church of *Rome* as we can) perform the Worſhip of God diſorderly and indecently, becauſe the Church of *Rome* does it otherwiſe? Are theſe ſome of the unanſwerable Arguments they ſo much boaſt of? From hardneſs of Heart, from blindneſs of Mind, and from being prejudic'd in Opinion, good Lord deliver me! for that will ſhut a Man's Eyes, and not ſuffer him to ſee the cleareſt and plaineſt Truths.

Could it be thought, that any Man profeſſing the pure and peaceable Goſpel of Chriſt, ſhould be ſo far given up, as to think the poſture of the Body makes or mars the Devotion of the Heart? But if they will ſtill be contentious about ſuch things, my Anſwer is (it was not ſaid for nothing, 1 *Cor.* xi. 16.) *We have no ſuch Cuſtom, neither the Churches of God.* In ſhort, I am really of opinion, that the Liturgy of the Church of *England* (which by them is repreſented to be ſo ridi-

culous a thing) is as grave, and as expreſſive of as much Devotion, as any one Form of Devotion now extant in the World; and could we (and O that we could) come up to that meaſure of Faith, Love, Humility and Zeal, that *Elias* and other renowned Worthies had; I doubt not but we might (in the uſe of that excellent Liturgy) obtain as great things from him, who loves to be ſtyl'd a God hearing Prayer, as they did. But alas, inſtead of this devout frame of Soul, how flat and dull is the Devotion of moſt Men? And ſince it is common to ſee Men corrupt in Principles, of careleſs and looſe behaviour in the Worſhip and Service of God, I think it may reaſonably be concluded, that this indecent, and as it were lifeleſs performance of God's holy Worſhip, is owing, not only to that innate Corruption which indiſpoſes us to the performance of all good in general; but alſo to thoſe too common Prejudices which ſome have imbib'd from the Books, and ſome from the Converſation they have with ſuch Men, as too frequently make it their buſineſs to prejudice the Minds of the weaker ſort, againſt the ſeveral Offices of the Church of *England:* Whence it comes to paſs, that one Man likes not this, and another likes not that part of our Service: And ſome there are (for inſtance *De Laune)* who have gone ſo far, as to deride the moſt ſacred things.

For pray now obſerve, with what levity he treats thoſe ſacred Expreſſions [r], *viz.* "*The* "*Lord be with thee*, muſt the Prieſt ſay; *and* "*with thy Spirit*, muſt the People ſay; *open*

[r] *Plea*, p. 52.

" *our Lips*, must the Priest say; and let *our* " *Mouths shew forth thy praise*, must the Peo- " ple say. Nay farther, even *Lord have mercy* " *upon us*, and *Christ have mercy upon us*, is by him expressed bandying or tossing of Prayers up and down, betwixt Priest and People. Once more then let every honest Man pray and say, Lord have mercy upon us, and so lead thy faithful People in the way of Truth; and from all such designing Men, as turn Religion into Rebellion, and Faith into Faction, good Lord deliver us.

As for what he says concerning our symbolizing with the Church of *Rome* in our Places of Worship, I have answer'd it before; and have shewn it to be the opinion of the *Assembly of Divines*, that there's no fault in it; and the like has been done in other Particulars; and therefore I shall not now trouble either my self or the Reader, with any repetition of them.

Thus have I at last brought my Reader through the six Particulars, which I at first propos'd to consider, by way of Examination, as well as in order to the confutation of the Arguments contain'd in *De Laune*'s *Plea*; which being done, I might now come to a conclusion of this Treatise; but being apprehensive, that some of *De Laune*'s Friends may think him unjustly dealt by, if I should silently pass over what he has farther said by way of Corroboration of that which went before: I must therefore beg my Readers attention, whilst I offer something by way of Examination and Reflection, on what he has there farther to offer, in order to prove us guilty of a sinful symbolizing with the *Church* of *Rome*; which

which for brevity ſake I ſhall do in this following method.

Firſt, I ſhall take notice of what he has cited for this purpoſe out of popiſh Authors.

Secondly, I ſhall obſerve what has been aſſerted concerning this matter by ſome of our Kings. And then,

Thirdly, I ſhall make ſome Reflections on what he cites for this purpoſe from the Books of ſome great Men of our own Party.

With reſpect to the firſt of theſe he ſays [s], "That the Jeſuit, Dr. *Carrier* ſays, That the "Common Prayer and Catechiſm contain no-"thing contrary to the *Romiſh* Service. And "*Mountague*, he ſays, does likewiſe aſſert, That "the Service of the *Church* of *England* is in moſt "things the ſame with that of the *Church* of "*Rome*; and that the differences are not ſo great, "that we ſhould make any ſeparation. Well, and what's the Conſequence of this, Sir? The Jeſuits ſay, the *Engliſh* Service differs not from the *Romiſh*, therefore it muſt and it ſhall be the ſame! for good Men they will not lie! Well, he goes on however, and in the next place tells us of a "certain Jeſuit, who not many Years "ſince coming to the Service of *Paul*'s, declar'd "he lik'd it exceeding well; neither had he "any exception to it, but that it was not done "by their Prieſts. It ſeems then the *Engliſh* Service is as *popiſh* as the Jeſuits themſelves can deſire. Wonderful Logick! ſure he would make thoſe Jeſuits to be a very ignorant ſort of Men; to burn and deſtroy, what they pretend to be ſo entirely in love with! but farther,

---

[s] *Plea*, p. 46.

"When

" When the *Pope* had interdicted Queen *Eli-*
" *zabeth*, says he, (upon a false information, I
suppose he would have us think, that the
English Service was contrary to his) " Secreta-
" ry *Walsingham* procured two Persons to come
" into *England* from the *Pope*, to whom he
" shewed the *London* and *Canterbury* Service (in
" their Cathedrals) in all the Pomp of it; who
" thereupon declar'd, that they wonder'd the
" *Pope* should be so ill inform'd and advis'd,
" to interdict a Prince, whose Service and Ce-
" remonies so symboliz'd with his own; and
" therefore returning to *Rome*, they possess'd
" the *Pope*, that they saw no Service, Cere-
" monies, or Orders in *England*, but might ve-
" ry well serve in *Rome*; whereupon the Bull
" was recall'd, says he. But why did the Pope
afterwards excommunicate her? Why in the
beginning of her Reign, says *Camden*, the change
of Religion was not suddenly made, but was
done by little and little gradually; for the *Ro-*
mish Religion continu'd in the same State it was,
a full Month and more after the Death of Queen
Mary; at which time, it may be, those two
Men came from *Rome*, if there is any truth in
that Story. However, the Queen so accommo-
dated matters of Religion to the *Romish* Clergy,
(who as yet were in Possession of the Bishopricks)
that for several Years, says Dr. *Heylin*, the Pa-
pists continued in the Communion of the Church;
but when the Queen had by little and little quite
alter'd the old; and by order of Parliament
Establish'd a *new*, or rather *Reform'd* the *old*
English Service: When she had publickly dis-
own'd the Pope's Supremacy, and put that Party
out of hope of ever re-establishing the *Romish*
Religion

Religion in *England*; why then *Walſingham* ſends no more to *Rome* for any body to ſee the *London* and *Canterbury* Service; but without more ado the *Pope* excommunicates her; and Whig like, not only abſolves all her Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance, but alſo curſes with *Anathema* all thoſe that obey her. They who are willing to know more of this matter, may, at their leiſure, conſult *Baker*'s *Chronicle*; where they will find, how, why, and when the change was made. Well,

" But *Curtain* ſays (ſays he) that he had heard " a Jeſuit ſay, he was in hopes our Service " and Ceremonies would return us again to " *Rome*. But by this time I ſuppoſe their hope is turn'd into fear; having by 150 years experience found, how vain a thing it is to hope without a promiſe. Alas, Sirs, it's not our *Service*, but our *Diviſions* which give them hopes of introducing Popery among us again, as all know, who have conſulted that ſmall Treatiſe call'd, *Foxes and Firebrands*; and the ſecond Volume of the *London Caſes*; in which we are told that Dr. *Bayly* the *Romaniſt* openly courted *Oliver* as the hopes of *Rome:* And farther, that *Coleman* on his Tryal own'd, that perhaps he thought Popery might come in, if *Liberty* of *Conſcience* had been granted; what reaſons they had to think ſo, the World is now tolerably well acquainted with.

For when the *Romaniſts* ſee, that the *Engliſh* are as it were ſuperſtitiouſly afraid of the very *Name* of *Popery* and Superſtition; and that it is an eaſier matter to get them to accept the *Thing* without the *Name*, than the *Name* without the *Thing:* They cunningly diſguiſe, and then mix themſelves

themſelves among our Diſſenters; and as ſuch, plead for a *Toleration* of all Religions, (except one) which being obtain'd under the ſpecious pretence of an indulgence to tender Conſciences; they then divide, and ſubdivide us into divers Sects and Parties; each of which brings along with it ſome popiſh Tenet or other: So that we ſeem to have well nigh received in the *Species*, what we pretend to reject in the *Genus*; and under a pretence of a farther Reformation in Religion, they have ſo gloſs'd the matter, that many are prevail'd on to believe that to be a *Reformation*, which in reality is a *Deformation* of it: What Cauſe this evil Effect is to be aſcrib'd to, I ſhall not take upon me to determine. Therefore leaving that,

Suppoſe I ſhould invert the Suppoſition of *Curtain*, and ſay, I am in hopes our Service and Ceremonies, *&c.* being ſo decent, *&c.* may again return the *Romaniſts* to us, of which I conceive there is by far the greateſt probability; unleſs they have all as ſqueamiſh a Stomach as Count *Gundemore*, (who as the Author of *Foxes* and *Firebrands* tells us) could by no means be prevail'd on to go to the Prayers of the King's Chapel, tho' his Preſence was at that time neceſſary, to be a Witneſs of the Oath there taken by the King, with relation to the matter then on Foot, between Prince *Charles*, afterwards *Charles* the Firſt, and the *Infanta Mary*, ſecond Siſter to the King of *Spain:* Now what ſhould occaſion this nicety, if the *Romiſh* and *Engliſh* Service were the ſame?

" But Mr. *Gage*, he ſays, has compar'd our " Service with that of *Rome*; and he finds no " difference, but only one is in *Engliſh*, and " the

" the other in *Latin*. And farther says, when " he was at *Rome* he was told by Father *Fitz* " *Herbert*, that the Common Prayer Book which " was compos'd for *Scotland*, was by Archbi- " shop *Laud* sent to *Rome*, to be first view'd by " the *Pope* and *Cardinals*; who, upon the peru- " sal, did approve thereof. Very well, then the *Pope* and *Cardinals*, it seems, approve of some things that are good! However,

As for Mr. *Gage*'s comparing the *English* and *Roman* Service, and finding no difference but *English* and *Latin*; I answer, it may be his Eyes were not very good, and therefore he could not see distinctly, or something else as bad was in the way. However, its certain, all the World beside is not blind, but can trust to their Eyes as well as he. Therefore all that I shall say farther to this pretence is, to advise the Reader to do as Mr. *Gage* has done, and consult the Books themselves; where they will find a great deal of difference both in Matter and Form; but in the want of those Books, let me advise the Reader to consult the Case of symbolizing in the second Volume of the *London* Cases; where they will find many of those differences collected together, and so I shall leave that matter.

And as for the Story of *Fitz Herbert*, I take it to be a lying report for the Reasons which here follow.

First, Because the *Pope*'s Supremacy was long before cast off in *England*; and therefore he was under no obligation to do so.

Secondly, Because it appears from the Letters of Sir *William Boswell*, and the Book which he wrote against Father *Fisher*; that he was the

greateſt Enemy to the Cauſe then on foot againſt the Church and King, betwixt the Papiſts and Diſſenters.

Thirdly, Becauſe it appears from the ſame Letters, that when the Papiſts found they could not gain the Biſhop over to their Party, no not with the offer of a Cardinal's Cap; then they did what they could to incenſe the *Scotch* againſt him. And therefore,

Fourthly, It's probable this Story of *Fitz Herbert* might be (as many others were) unjuſtly trump'd up againſt him to bring him to his end. However, be the Relation true or not, let the Pope approve or diſapprove of our Liturgy, I care not; if it be in its ſelf good, his Commendation cannot make it bad; if it be in it ſelf bad, his diſlike can make it never the better: I am very ſenſible he can ſpeak well or ill of any thing to ſerve his own and his Church's turn. In Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days, he would have confirm'd it, if the Queen would have rank'd her ſelf and Subjects with the *Church* of *Rome*, and own all from her Authority: Did not that ſhew his love to it? In Queen *Mary*'s Days he was for burning of it: And you know, the only way to expreſs ones Love to a Friend, is to put him in the Fire and burn him.

From the whole then, I conclude, it's no matter whether the *Pope*, and his Party like or diſlike, approve or diſapprove, bleſs or curſe our Liturgy: Since its plain from undeniable Fact, their Deſign is by all means poſſible to diſgrace it; and could they have an Opportunity, the Diſſenters may depend on it, they are ready to joyn with them in a ſolemn League and Covenant,

nant, and with Hands lift up to God, will swear (with as much Truth and Honesty as they once did) to destroy it. In short, if Bishop *Laud* did send the Book to *Rome* as is (with very little Reason) pretended, it was an Act of his done contrary to the *Laws* of the *Land* and the *Canons* of the Church, and so he only was accountable for it: And if the *Pope* and *Cardinals* did then and there approve the same; it was done with a politick Design against their own settled Principles, and therefore no Notice is to be taken of it. But then,

Secondly, Let us take a view of what is produced by him for this Purpose, from the Sayings of some of our Kings. And the first that he produces, is King *Edward* the sixth, who in his Letter to the *Devonshire* Men, tells them, that the *English Service* is Word for Word the same with that of *Rome*; for nothing is altered says he, only a few things taken away (which it seems were less than nothing) which it would have been a shame to have heard in *English*; as if it were a greater Fault to have found things in *English* than in *Latin!* But if there was no Alteration, why did the *Devonshire* Men complain? Why then should the King himself say, there was a few things altered or taken away, too fond to be heard in *English?* However, *De Laune* says, there were some more Alterations made in the second Year of his Reign, and some in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days; but the Corruptions, it seems, were like the Widow's Barrel of Meal that wasted not, though there was daily some taken from it: For notwithstanding those before-mentioned Reformations, yet he tells us, that King *James* said it was an evil said *Mass* in *English*, and wanted

wanted nothing of the *Mass* but the Liftings: But this he spake it seems when he was in *Scotland*, and sat as he elsewhere said [t] among beardless Boys, who made him believe that the *English* Men worshipped their Wives: But when he came to *England* and sat among wise and learned Men, we are sure he was of another Mind, and esteemed it not as an evil said *Mass*, but as the best form of Service in the World: And as for the Opinion of King *Charles* the first concerning this matter, I think the World needs not now be told it, what he said in answer to a Petition presented to him at *Hampton-Court* the first of *December* 1641; what he said to his Sons a little before his Death, and what he said on the Scaffold by the motion of Dr. *Juxton* at the very hour of Death, does fully evince what he thought of the Matter. If these be not sufficient Testimonies of their approbation, I'll no more argue from Practice to Principle. But then,

Thirdly, As for what he cites for this Purpose out of the Writings of *Cambden*, Dr. *Heylin*, *Burnet*, and others; as I see nothing to this Purpose in them, I shall silently pass them over, and leave the Dissenters to make the best use they can of what they have said: For my own part I declare, I have not willingly passed over any thing which I could think in any measure serviceable to their Cause; but have endeavoured to make use of such Arguments to convince others, as have been used in the Conviction of my self, which I in my Conscience believe have in them greater Force, than any made use of by *De Laune*, or any other against the *Church* of *Eng-*

[t] *In the Conference at* Hampton-Court.

land,

land. Which Church, that God would defend her as with a Wall of Braſs round about; that he would daily purify her within; that he would ſo cloath her Prieſts with Righteouſneſs, and each and every Member with ſuch Purity of Heart and Hand, that all Men may ſee and ſay; doubtleſs ſhe is a truly Apoſtolick Church of Chriſt: And finally, that he would not only diſappoint the Deſigns, and bring to naught all the Counſels of her open and ſecret Enemies; but that he would ſo bleſs her with all ſpiritual Bleſſings here, that ſhe may be the Praiſe of the whole Earth: And when time ſhall be no more, that this *Militant* may make up a conſiderable part of the *Triumphant* Church of Chriſt, is what I moſt earneſtly wiſh and pray for; and they that can wiſh it more Happineſs, let them with all my Heart.

Thus, dear Reader, have I at laſt given you an account, why the Arguments uſed by *De Laune* and others againſt the Church of *England*, have not prevail'd with me to think her (as ſhe is repreſented by them) a *Babyloniſh Whore*, but on the contrary (for the Reaſons before-mentioned) I verily believe her to be as pure a Chriſtian Church, as any on the Face of the Earth.

As for that hideous Image of the Beaſt with which he pins the Basket; I think it to be very ill drawn; and though I have no great Skill in thoſe kind of Repreſentations, yet methinks this Beaſt is not like the Dragon he ſpeaks of, for there ſeems to me to be a great deal of Difference betwixt them, both in Heads and Horns: Nay, truly on a ſecond View, I much queſtion, whether this Beaſt be

more like a *Romiſh* Whore, that goes from her Husband, or a *Phanatical* Jilt that continues with, but defiles her Husband's Bed. But be that as it will, it's now time enough for the Reader to judge when he has heard both Parties, let him now determine his Judgment and Practice as he ſees Cauſe: If what has been ſaid, convince him not, he may ſay, he has read my Reaſon, I'll do as much for him if he'll let me have the ſame Opportunity: If what has been ſaid, be any way beneficial to thee, it's what I wiſh, give God the Praiſe: If any thing be ſaid amiſs, let it be imputed to my want of Skill to do better: Let it be rejected, but remember me in thy Prayers.

F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for, and Sold by William Innys, *at the* Prince's Arms *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard.*

JO. *Morinus* de Sacris Eccleſiæ Ordinationibus, ſecundum antiquos & recentiores Latinos, Græcos, Syros, &c. Antv. fol. 1695.

Novum D. N. *Jeſu Chriſti* Teſtamentum juxta Editionem Bibliorum Polyglot. In qua Textus Græcus cum verſione interlineari, & Vulg. Lat. Tranſlationes Antiquæ Syriaca, Arabica, Æthiopica, totius Novi Teſtamenti, Perſica, Evangeliorum & ſingularum Verſiones Latinæ, omnia eo ordine diſpoſita ut Textus cum Verſionibus uno intuitu conferri poſſint. Cum variis Lectionibus & Annotationibus Græc. Lat. Syr. Æthiop. Perſic. &c. Edidit *Brianus Waltonus*, S. T. D. Epiſc. Ceſtrienſis.

Expoſitory Notes, with Practical Obſervations on the New Teſtament of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; wherein the ſacred Text is at large recited, the Senſe explain'd, *&c.* By *William Burkit*, M. A. The ſixth Edition. fol. 1716.

The Works of the moſt Reverend Dr. *John Tillotſon*, late Lord Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*. Collected in III. Vol. with an alphabetical Table of the principal Matters. 1717.

Theſaurus Linguæ Sanctæ, ſive Concordantiale Lexicon Hebræo-Latino-Biblicum: in quo, Lexica omnia Hebraica hucuſq; Edita Methodice, ſuccincte & quaſi Synoptice, exhibentur; una cum Concordantiis Hebraicis; in quibus, univerſæ & ſingulæ voces Hebræo-Biblicæ, (cum locis ſuis, quibus, in Textu occurrunt) interpretatæ ſunt, & expoſitæ; atque etiam, Grammaticæ, ſub ſuis propriis Radicibus quibuſlibet reſolutæ; ad faciliorem, magiſq; commodum ſtudioſorum, & Hebræo-Philologicorum, uſum & progreſſum, in Lingua ſancta Hebraica diſcenda, vel docenda. Per *Gul. Robertſon* 4to *Lond.* 1680.

Jac. Uſſeri Hiſtoria Dogmatica Controverſiæ inter Orthodoxos & Pontificios de Scripturis & ſacris Vernaculis, cum Notis *Hen. Wharton. Lond.* 1690. 4*to.*

Dr. *Maningham's* Sermons on ſeveral Occaſions. 4*to.*

Miraculous Works above and contrary to Nature. 4*to.*

The Hiſtory of the Church of *Malabar*, from the Time of its being firſt diſcover'd by the *Portugues* in 1501. Giving an Account of the Perſecution and violent Methods of the *Roman* Prelates, to reduce them to the Church of *Rome*, &c. By *M. Geddes.* 8*vo.*

Twenty

Twenty four Sermons preach'd on ſeveral Occaſions. In 2 Vol. 8*vo.* 1710.

The Influence of Converſation, with the Regulation thereof; being a Sermon preach'd at St. *Clements Dane* to a religious Society 12°.

An Enquiry after Happineſs. In three Parts: 1. Of the Poſſibility of obtaining Happineſs. 2. Of the true Notion of Human Life. 3. Of religious Perfection. In 2 Vol. 8*vo.* The fifth Edition 1717.

The Spiritual Year: Or, Devout Contemplations, digeſted into diſtinct Arguments for every Month in the Year, and for every Week in that Month 12°.

The Duty of Servants: Containing, 1. Their Preparation for, and Choice of a Service. 2. Their Duty in Service; together with Prayers ſuited to each Duty; all which may be accommodated likewiſe for the moſt part to Apprentices: to which is added, a Diſcourſe of the Sacrament, ſuited peculiarly to Servants. The third Edition. 12°.

The plain Man's Guide to Heaven; Containing his Duty, 1. Towards God. 2. Towards his Neighbour. With proper Prayers, Meditations, and Ejaculations; deſign'd chiefly for the Countreyman, Tradeſman, Labourer, and the like. The third Edition 12°. 1709.

Practical Chriſtianity, or an Account of the Holineſs which the Goſpel enjoyns, with Motives to it, and the Remedies propoſed againſt Temptation; with a Prayer concluding each diſtinct Duty. The ſixth Edition 8*vo.*

Chriſtian Thoughts for every Day of the Month with Prayers: Wherein is repreſented the Nature of unfeigned Repentance, and of perfect Love towards God. 12*vo. Lond.* 1705. Theſe Eight by *Richard Lucas* D. D. late Prebendary of *Weſtminiſter.*

Practical Obſervations upon the Miracles of our bleſſed Saviour; together with ſome extraordinary Paſſages of his Life. By *Fr. Bragg*, B. D. In 2 Vol. 8*vo.*

Practical Diſcourſes upon the Parables of our Bleſſed Saviour, with Prayers annexed to each Diſcourſe. In 2 Vol. 8*vo.* By the ſame Author.

The wiſdom of God manifeſted in the Works of the Creation, in two Parts. *viz.* The Heavenly Bodies, Elements, Meteors, Foſſils, Vegetables, (Beaſts, Birds, Fiſhes, and Inſects) more particularly in the Body of the Earth, its Figure, Motion, and Conſiſtency, and in the admirable Structure of the Bodies of Man, and other Animals, as alſo in their Generation, *&c.* With Anſwers to ſome Objections.

ons. By *John Ray*, late fellow of the Royal Society. The Sixth Edition, 1714. 8*vo.*

Joannis Raii, Synopsis Methodica Avium & Piscium; Opus Posthumum, quod vivus recensuit & perfecit ipse insignissimus Author: in quo multas Species, in ipsius Ornithologiâ & Ichthyologia desideratas, adjecit: Methodumque suam Piscium Naturæ magis convenientem reddidit. Cum Appendice, & Iconibus, 1713.

Three *Physico-Theological* Discourses, concerning I. The Primitive Chaos and Creation of the World. II. The general Deluge, its Causes and Effects. III. The Dissolution of the World, and future Conflagration. Wherein are largely discussed, the Production and use of Mountains; the Original of Fountains, of formed Stones, and Sea-Fishes Bones and Shells found in the Earth; the Effects of particular Floods, and Inundations of the Sea; the Eruptions of Vulcano's; the Nature and Causes of Earthquakes. Also an historical Account of those two late remarkable ones in *Jamaica* and *England*. With practical Inferences. By *John Ray*, late Fellow of the *Royal Society*. The third Edition, illustrated with Copper-Plates, and much more enlarged than the former Editions, from the Author's own MSS, 1713. *These three published by the Reverend Mr.* Derham.

Minutius Felix. English'd by Mr. *Combe.*

Chauvin de Religione Naturali. 8*vo.*

Knatchbull in Novum Testamentum. 8*vo.*

Launoii opera Varia Theologica. 4*to.* & 8*vo.*

Leusdeni Compendium Novi Testamenti. 8*vo.*

Sanderson de obligatione Conscientiæ, &c. 8*vo.* 1710.

Spicilegium S. S. Patrum, ut & Hæreticorum, Seculi post Christum natum I. II. & III. Quorum vel integra monumenta, vel fragmenta partim ex aliorum Patrum Libris jam impressis collegit & cum Cod. MSS. contulit, partim ex MSS primum edidit, ac singula tam Præfatione, quam Notis subjunctis illustravit *J. E. Grabius.* Editio secunda auctior. 2 Vol. 8*vo. Oxon.* 1714.

Andrews Preces privatæ, Gr. Lat. 12*o. Oxon.*

Clifletti Canones & Decreta Concilii Tridentini.

Colomesii Observationes Sacræ.

A Sermon preached before his Majesty King *George* at his Royal Chapel of St. *James's* on Sunday *Feb.* 3. 1716.17. By *Richard Bentley* D. D. Master of *Trinity* College in *Cambridge* Library-Keeper and Chaplain to His Majesty.

The wise Steward: Set forth in a Sermon upon Charity. preach'd

preach'd at the Parish-Church of *Chelsea* on Sunday the 29*th* of *July* 1716. 8*vo*.

Practical Discourses upon the Lord's Prayer preach'd before the Honourable Society of *Lincoln's-Inn*. 8*vo*. 1717. Both by *Tho. Mangey* M. A. Chaplain at *Whitehall*, and Fellow of St. *John*'s College in *Cambridge*.

Le Blanc. (Lud.) Theses Theologicæ, fol. Lond. 1708

Biblia Sacra Polyglotta cum Lexico Castelli, 8 Vol. fol. ibid.

Clerici (Joannis) Historia Ecclesiastica duorum primorum à Christo nato Sæculorum è veteribus Monumentis deprompta, 4*to*. Amst. 1716

S. Clementis Epistolæ duæ ad Corinthios, 8*vo*. *Lond.* 1687

Cave (Gul.) Epistola apologetica adv. le Clerc, 8*vo*. ibid. 1702

Castelli (Edm.) Lexicon Heptaglotton, Heb. Chald. Syriac. Samarit. Æthiop. Arab. conjunctim; & Persicum separatim. Opus non tantum ad Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia, Biblia Regia Parisiensia, Biblia Regia Antwerpiana, Bibliaque Card. Ximenis Complutensia; sed ad omnes omnino tam MSS. quam impressos Libros, in universis hisce Linguis extantes apprime utile & perneceſſarium, 2 Vol. fol.

Dale (Ant. van) Dissertatio super Aristea de LXX interpretibus, additur Historia Baptismorum, &c. 4*to*. Amst. 1705

—— De Origine & Progressu Idololatriæ, 4*to*. Amst. 1696

S. Dionysii Areopagitæ Opera, Gr. Lat. fol. 2 Vol. Ant. 1634

Dawsoni (Johannis) Lexicon Novi Testamenti, Gr. Lat. 8*vo*. Cant. 1705

Forbesii (Johannis) opera omnia, 2 Vol. fol. Amst.

Ferrarius (Bernard) de Ritu Sacrarum Ecclesiæ, 8*vo*.

Fabricius (J. Seob.) de Unitate Ecclesiæ Brittannicæ, 8*vo* Oxon. 1678

S. Gregorii Turonensis opera omnia, fol. Paris 1699

Herodotus cum Notis Gale, Gronovii & aliorum, fol. Ludg. Bat. 1716

Huetii (Pet. Dan.) Demonstratio Evangelica, fol. Paris 1690

Herbert (Ed. D. Cherbury) de Religione Gentilium, 8*vo*. Amst. 1700

Hody (Humph.) contra Historiam Aristeæ, 8*vo*. ib. 1684

S. Irenæi Episc. Lugd. Fragmenta anecdota quæ ex Bibl. Taur. eruit, Latina versione notisque donavit, duabus Dissertationibus de Oblatione & Consecratione Eucharistiæ illustravit, denique Liturgia Græca Jo. Ern. Grabii & Dissertatione

tatione de Prejudiciis Theologicis auxit A M. Pfaffius, 8*vo*. Hag. Com. 1715

Jamblicus de Mysteriis Gr. Lat. fol. per Tho. Gale, Oxon 1678

Leydekker (Sam.) Exercitationes Selectæ Historico-Theologicæ. 2 Vol. 1712

Listeri (Mart.) In Sanctorium de Medicina Statica, 12mo *Lond.* 1716

Morinus (Stephanus) de Primæva Lingua, 4*to* Ultr. 1694.

Origen Contra Celsum, cum Notis Spenceri, Gr. Lat. 4*to* Cant. 1677

Philostratorum quæ supersunt omnia Gr. Lat. fol. Lipsiæ 1709

Parker (Sam.) de Deo & Providentia Divina, 4*to* Lond. 1678

Surenhusii (Gul.) de Theologorum Hebræorum Formulis allegandi & modis interpretandi tractatus, 4*to* Amst. 1712

Testamentum Novum Gr. Millii & Var. Lect. 8*vo*. Amst. 1711

Velthusii (Lamb.) Opera omnia, 2 Vol. 4*to*. Rot. 1680

Vitæ Selectorum aliquot Virorum qui Doctrinâ, Dignitate ac Pietate inclaruere. Publ. per G. Batesium, 4*to*. Lond. 1681

Wilkins (David) Paraphrasis Chaldaica in libros Duos Chronicorum 4*to*. ibid. 1715

Whitby (Dan.) Ethices Compendium in Usum Academicæ Iuventutis, 8*vo*. Lond. 1713.

The Christians best Guide; or, the Religious Man's Companion. In 3 Parts 8*vo*. *Lond.* 1716

The Nonjurors Separation from the publick Assemblies of the Church of England examin'd, and proved to be Schismatical upon their own Principles. The second Edition 8*vo*. Price 6 d.

A Discourse of Schism shewing I. what is meant by Schism. II. That Schism is a damnable Sin. III. That there is a Schism beween the establish'd Church of England and the Dissenters. IV. That this Schism is to be charged on the Dissenter's Side. V. That the Modern Pretences of Toleration, Agreement in Fundamentals, *&c.* will not excuse the Dissenters from being guilty of Schism. Written by way of Letter to three dissenting Ministers in *Essex*, *viz.* Mr. *Gilson* and Mr. *Gledhill* of *Colchester* and Mr *Shepherd* of *Braintree*. To which is annexed, an Answer to a Book intituled, *Thomas* against *Bennet*, or the Protestant Dissenters vindicated from the Charge of Schism, with the two Defences. The fourth Edition 8*vo*. 1716.

Directions for Studying: 1st. General System or Body of

of Divinity. 2d. The 39 Articles of Religion. To which is added, St. Jerom's Epiſtle to Nepotianus. The ſecond Edition, 8*vo.*

An Eſſay on the 39 Articles of Religion agreed on in the Year 1652, and reviſed in the Year 1571; wherein (the Text being firſt exhibited in Latin and Engliſh, and the minuteſt Variations of 18 the moſt ancient and authentick Copies carefully noted) an Account is given of the Proceedings of Convocations in framing and ſettling the Text of the Articles; the controverted Clauſe of the 20th Article is demonſtrated to be genuine; and the Caſe of Subſcription to the Articles in point of Law, Hiſtory and Conſcience. With a prefatory Epiſtle to *Anthony Collins Eſq*; wherein the egregious Falſhoods and Calumnies of the Author of Prieſtcraft in Perfection, are expoſed 8*vo.* 1715.

The Caſe of the reformed Epiſcopal Churches in Great *Poland* and *Poliſh Pruſſia* conſidered, in a Sermon preach'd on Sunday *Nov.* 18. 1716. at St. *Laurence-Jewry*, *London*, in the Morning, and St. *Olaves Southwark* in the Afternoon. The ſecond Edition 8*vo.* 1716.

Theſe five by the Reverend Dr. *Bennet.*

Mr. Derham's Phyſico-Theology, or a Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God, from his Works of Creation. The fourth Edition, 8*vo.*

——— Aſtro- Theology, or Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God, from a Survey of the Heavens. Illuſtrated with Copper Plates. The ſecond Edition, 8*vo.*

The Poſthumous Works of Dr. *Robert Hooke*; in which, I. The preſent Deficiency of natural Philoſophy is diſcourſed of, with the Methods of rendring it more certain and beneficial. II. Of the Nature, Motion, and Effects of Light, particularly that of the Sun and Comets. III. an hypothetical Explication of Memory; how the Organs made uſe of by the Mind in its Operation may be mechanically underſtood. IV. An Hypotheſis and Explication of the Cauſe of Gravity, or Gravitation, Magnetiſm, *&c.* V. Diſcourſes of Earthquakes, their Cauſes and Effects, and Hiſtories of ſeveral; to which are annex'd, phyſical Explications of ſeveral of the Fables in *Ovid*'s Metamorphoſes, very different from other mythologick Interpreters. VI. Lectures for improving Navigation and Aſtronomy, with the Deſcriptions of ſeveral new and uſeful Inſtruments and Contrivances; the whole full of curious Diſquiſitions and Experiments, illuſtrated with Sculptures. To theſe Diſcourſes is perfix'd the Author's Life. By *Richard Waller*, Eſq; R. S. Secr.

A CATALOGUE of BOOKS Printed for and Sold by *A. Betteſworth*, at the *Red-Lion* in *Pater-Noſter-Row*.

A	l.	s.	d
Atalantis, 4 Vol. 12ves.	00	09	00
Apuleius's Golden Aſs, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	06	00
Atlas Manuale: Or, A Sett of ſmall Maps. By Moll. 8vo.	00	05	00
Athenian Oracle, now in the Preſs, 8vo.			
Acta Regia: Or, An Abridgment of Mr. Rymer's Fœdera. Publiſh'd Monthly, at 1s. each.			
Apollo's Feaſt, 12ves.	00	01	00
Art of Pleaſing in Converſation, in French and Engliſh. By Cardinal Richlieu. 12ves.	00	03	00
Agreeable Variety, 8vo.	00	03	05
Art of Thinking. Tranſlated by Ozell. 12ves.	00	03	06
Arabian Nights Entertainment, Compleat, 6 Vol. 12ves.	00	15	00
Abridgment Statutes, 6 Vol. 8vo.	01	10	00
Addiſon's Travels, 12ves.	00	03	00
Works, 3 Vol. 12ves.	00	09	00
Works, 4 Vol. 4to.	03	00	00
Accompliſh'd Conveyancer, 3 Vol. 8vo.	00	18	00

B			
BRidgman's Conveyancer, Folio.	01	10	00
Biſhop Blackhall's Works, 2 Vol. Folio.	01	12	00
Biſhop Burnet on the Thirty nine Articles, Folio.	00	12	00
Abridgment of his Hiſtory of the Reformation, 3 Vol. 12ves.	00	09	00
Dr. Barrow's Works, 2 Vol. Fol.	02	02	00
Book of Homiles, Folio, 1726.	00	12	00
Boyce on the Thirty nine Articles, Folio.	00	09	00
Burnet's Theory of the Earth, 2 Vol. 8vo.	00	12	00
Dr. Bates Works, Folio, 1724.	01	07	06
Burnet's (Dr. Thomas) Sermons at Boyle's Lectures, for the Years 1724, 1725, 2 Vol.	00	09	00
Eſſay upon Government, 8vo.	00	01	06
Scripture Trinity, 8vo.	00	02	00
Blackmore's (Sir Richard) Eſſays, 2 Vol. 8vo.	00	11	00
Creation, a Poem, 12ves.	00	02	00
Redemption, a Poem; being a Supplement to the Creation, 8vo.	00	04	00
Buchanan's Hiſtory of Scotland, 2 Vol. Engliſh, with curious Cuts, 8vo.	00	11	00
Boyer's French and Engliſh Dictionary, 8vo.	00	07	00
Telemachus, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	05	06
Bailey's Etymological Engliſh Dictionary	00	07	00
Tranſlation of Eraſmus Colloquies.	00	05	06
Bruyere's Works, 2 Vol. Tranſlated from the French, 8vo.	00	09	00
Betterton's Life with the Amorous Widow.	00	03	06
Behn's Novels, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	05	00
Plays, 4 Vol. 12ves.	00	12	00
Boerhave's Aphoriſms, Tranſlated into Engliſh, 8vo.	00	05	06
Mrs. Barker's Novels, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	05	00
Patchwork Screen, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	05	00
Britiſh Apollo, 3 Vol. 12ves. containing two Thouſand Anſwers to Curious Queſtions in moſt Arts and Sciences, 12ves.	00	09	00

	l.	s.	d.
British Compendium: Containing the Descents of the English, Scotch, and Irish Nobility, with their Arms curiously Engraven, 3 Vols. 12ves.	01	02	06
Builders Dictionary, 8vo.	00	04	00
Dr. Brown of Cold Baths. 12ves.	00	01	06
Boileau's Art of Poetry, 4 Canto's, 12ves.	00	01	00
Lutrin: An Heroi-Comical Poem.	00	01	06
Bulstrode (Whitlock) Essays, 8vo.	00	04	06
Bridges of Fractions, 12ves.	00	01	00
Bradley's New Improvements in Planting and Gardening, 8vo.	00	06	06
Bythe's Art of Poetry, 2 Vol.	00	05	00
Blackmore's Ecclesiastical Antiquity, abridg'd from Bingham, 2 Vol.	00	11	00
Ball's Astrology improv'd	00	02	00
Burkett of the New Testament, Folio.	01	03	00
Beveridge's Private Thoughts, 8vo.	00	09	00
Ditto, 12ves.	00	01	06
Prayer, 8vo.	00	03	06
Ditto, 12ves.	00	01	06
Blackmore on Consumptions, 8vo.	00	03	06
on the Spleen	00	05	06
on the Gout and Rheumatism	00	03	06
on the Vapours.	00	04	06
Bingham's Antiquities, 2 Vols. Folio.	02	10	00
Brown (Tho.) Works, 5 Vols. 12ves.	00	12	06
Bishop's Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture, 8vo.	00	05	00
Baynard of Hot and Cold Baths, 8vo.	00	05	06

C

CAssandra: A fam'd Romance, 5 Vols. 12ves	00	15	00
Cook of Forest Trees, 8vo.	00	03	06
Bishop Cumberland, De Legibus Naturæ, 8vo.	00	06	00
Cato's Letters, 4 Vols. 12ves	00	10	00
Cave's Primitive Christianity, 8vo.	00	04	06
Calamy's (Benj.) Sermons, 8vo.	00	04	06
Clark's Body of Divinity, 2 Vol. 8vo.	00	09	00
Cocker's English Dictionary, 8vo.	00	02	00
Decimal Arithmetick, 8vo.	00	03	06
Countess of Morton's Devotions, 24s.	00	00	06
Dr. Comber's Companion to the Altar, 8vo.	00	04	06
Christian Pattern, Translated from the Latin of Tho. a Kempis, 24s.	00	01	00
Culpeper's English Physician Enlarg'd	00	02	06
Midwife, 12ves.	00	02	06
Dispensatory, 12ves.	00	02	06
Courtier, Translated from the Italian.	00	05	00
Cap of Gray Hairs for a Green Head, 8vo.	00	01	06
Croxall's Æsop's Fables, 12ves.	00	03	00
Cox's History of Carolina, 8vo.	00	02	06
Crusoe's Life abridg'd, in a neat Pocket Volume, 12ves.	00	02	06
Cambray's Private Thoughts upon Religion, 12ves.	00	02	06
Cornelius Nepos, English'd by several Hands, 12ves.	00	02	00
Cockman's Tully's Offices, 12ves.	00	02	06
Christian's Companion to the Closet and Altar, 12ves.	00	02	06
Chevalier de Vaudray, a Novel, 12ves.	00	02	00
Cole's Latin and English Dictionary, 8vo.	00	06	00
Cæsar ex Recensione, Tho. Purfell, 12ves.	00	02	06
Cum Notis Delphini, 8vo.	00	06	06
Constitutions, Canons, and Articles, of the Church of England, 8vo.	00	02	06

Clark's

	l.	s.	d.
Clark's Anſwer to the Religion of Nature delineated, 8vo.	00	01	00
Ditto, againſt Hutchinſon's Ideas of Beauty, 8vo.	00	01	06
Clarendon's (Lord) Hiſtory of the Rebellion, 6 Vols. 8vo.	01	10	00
Caſes againſt the Diſſenters, 3 Vols. 8vo.	00	15	00
Clark, (Dr. Samuel) on the Attributes, 8vo.	00	06	00
Seventeen Sermons at St. James's, 8vo.	00	06	00
on the Goſpels, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	11	00
Cheyne (Dr.) on Health and Long Life, 8vo.	00	04	06
Congreve's Plays and Poems, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	09	00
Critical Hiſtory of England, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	11	00
Cheſelden's Anatomy, 8vo.	00	06	00
Cambden's Britannia, 2 Vols. Folio.	03	10	00
Churches no Charnel Houſes, proving the Indecency of Burying in Churches and Church-Yards.	00	01	
Carcaſe's Book of Rates, Folio. 1726.	01	05	
Comical Hiſtory of Francion, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Chambers's Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, 2 Vols. Folio.			
Chillingworth's Works, Folio, 1726.	00	12	06
Chandler (Biſhop) Defence of Chriſtianity, 8vo.	00	05	06
Collier's Sacred Interpreter, 2 Vol. 8vo.	00	10	00
Cambray of the Being and Exiſtence of God, 12ves.	00	03	00
Clarendon and Whitlock compared, 8vo.	00	05	00
Collier's Antoninus, 8vo.	00	04	06

D

Domat's Civil Law in its Natural Order, Tranſlated by Dr. Strahan, 2 Vols. Fol.	02	02	00
Dupin's Method of Studying Divinity, 8vo.	00	05	00
Dionis's Midwifry, Engliſh, 8vo.	00	04	06
Devout Chriſtian's Companion, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	06	00
Dacier's Abridgment of Plato's Works. Tranſlated from the French, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	00
Drelincourt of Death, 8vo.			
Dictionarium Ruſticum & Urbanicum: Or, A Dictionary of Country Affairs, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	05	00
	00	09	00
Defoe's Works, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Drexelius's Hourly Companion, 12ves.	00	01	00
Derham's Phyſico-Theology, 8vo.	00	06	00
Aſtro-Theology, 8vo.	00	04	06
Dupin's Hiſtory of the Church, abridg'd, in four neat Pocket-Volumes, 12ves.	00	10	00
Dryden's Plays, in 6 Vols. 12ves.	01	00	00
Miſcellanies, 6 Vols. 12ves.	00	18	00
Virgil, with Cuts, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	11	00
Juvenal, 12ves.	00	03	06
Fables.	00	05	06
Ditton, on the Reſurrection, 8vo.	00	05	00
on Fluids, 8vo.	00	03	00
Defence of the Female Sex.	00	03	00
Dalton's Country Juſtice, with large Additions, by W. Nelſon, Eſq; Folio, 1726.	01	05	00
Danois's Tales of the Fairies, 3 Vol. 12ves.	00	07	06
Dictionary of all Religions, 8vo.	00	04	06
Degolls on Worms, 8vo.	00	01	06
Doctor Hiſtoricus, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00

E

	£.	s.	
ENgland's Intereſt: Or, The Gentleman and Farmer's Friend.	00	01	06
Engliſh Liberties: Or, The Free-born Subjects Inheritance. By W. Nelſon, Eſq;	00	04	06
Eſſay on the Tranſmutation of the Blood, 8vo.	00	01	00
Eutropius, in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	02	06
Echard's Hiſtory of England, Folio.	01	16	00
Roman Hiſtory, 5 Vols. 8vo.	01	05	00
Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	09	00
Gazetteer, in Two Parts, 12ves.	00	03	06
Terence, 12ves.	00	02	06
Hiſtory of the Revolution, 8vo.	00	04	06
Euſebius's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Engliſh, Folio.	01	00	00
Etheridge's Plays, 12ves.	00	03	00
Engliſh Expoſitor, 12ves.	00	01	00
Echard's (Dr.) Works, 8vo.	00	04	06
England's Black Tribunal, 12ves.	00	02	06
Everard's Gauging, 12ves.	00	02	06
Eikon Baſilike: To which is added, The Life of King Charles the Firſt, by Perinchief.	00	05	06

F

FLavell's Works, 2 Vol. Folio.	02	00	00
Husbandry Spiritualiz'd, 12ves.	00	02	00
Navigation Spiritualiz'd, 8vo.	00	01	06
Biſhop Fleetwood's Relative Duties, 8vo.	00	04	06
Fiſher's Arithmetick, 12ves.	00	02	06
Farrier's and Horſeman's Dictionary, 8vo.	00	05	06
Familiar Letters of Love and Gallantry, in Two neat Pocket Volumes, 12ves.	00	05	00
Florus in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	04	06
Frauds of the Romiſh Prieſts and Monks, in Two Volumes, 12ves.	00	05	06
Fable of the Bees. 8vo.	00	05	06
Friend's Hiſtory of Phyſick, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Freeholder, 12ves.	00	03	00
Fuller's Pharmacopœia Extemporanea, 12ves.	00	03	00
The ſame in Engliſh, 8vo.	00	05	06
Fidde's Sermons, Folio.	00	17	06
Farquhar's Plays and Poems, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	06	00

G

GOodman's (Dr.) Penitent pardoned, 8vo.	00	04	06
Winter Evening Conference, 8vo.	00	04	00
Old Religion, 12ves.	00	02	06
Glanvill of Witches, 1726. 8vo.	00	05	06
Gordon's (Patrick) Geographical Grammar, 8vo.	00	06	00
(George) Introduction to Geography, Aſtronomy, Dyalling, and Chronology, 8vo. 1726.	00	04	06
Gerhard's Meditations. By Rowell.	00	03	00
Ditto, ſmall Edition.	00	01	00
Gentleman Angler, 12ves.	00	01	06
Gaſtrell's Chriſtian Inſtitutes, 12ves.	00	02	06
Gentleman Inſtructed, 8vo.	00	02	06
Guillim's Diſplay of Heraldry, Folio.	02	02	00
Gentleman Jockey, 8vo.	00	01	06
Gibſon's Farrier's Guide, 8vo.	00	05	00
Farmer's Diſpenſatory, 8vo.	00	04	06
Method of Dieting Horſes, 8vo.	00	03	06

	l.	s.	d.
Gay's Paſtorals,	00	01	06
Gedde's Tracts, 3 Vols. 8vo.	00	18	00
Guardian, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	00
Gardner's Dictionary, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	12	00
Gibſon's Anatomy of Human Bodies, 8vo.	00	05	06

H

HENRY, (Matthew) on the Bible, 6 Vols.	06	06	00
Works, Collected into One Volume,	01	07	06
Hooker's Eccleſiaſtical Polity, 1724, Folio.	01	01	00
Horneck's (Dr.) Crucified Jeſus, 8vo.	00	05	06
on Conſideration, 8vo.	00	04	06
Beſt Exerciſe, 8vo.	00	04	06
Fire of the Altar, 12ves.	00	01	00
Handley's Mechanical Eſſays on the Animal Oeconomy, 8vo.	00	05	00
Colloquia Chirurgica: Or, The Whole Art of Surgery, 8vo.	00	02	06
Hawney's Trigonometry, 8vo.	00	06	00
Compleat Meaſurer. 12ves.	00	02	06
Hiſtory of England, 4 Vols. 8vo. With the Heads of all the Kings and Queens curiouſly Engrav'd.	01	02	00
Howell's (Lawrence) Hiſtory of the Bible, 3 Vols. With 150 Copper Plates, 3 Vols. 8vo.	01	00	00
Howell's (James) Familiar Letters, 8vo.	00	05	00
Harris's (Dr.) Lexicon Technicum, 2 Vols. Folio.	02	10	00
Hudibras, in Three Parts; with a new Sett of Cuts.	00	03	00
Hiſtory and Preſent State of the Kingdom of France, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	06	00
Hatton's Pſaltar, 12ves.	00	02	06
Howard's Neweſt Way of Cookery, 12ves	00	02	06
Hiſtory of Engliſh Martyrs in Queen Mary's Reign, 8vo.	00	04	06
Hatton's Comes Comercii, 8vo.	00	02	00
Hiſtory of Hungary, 12ves.	00	02	06
Hewit's Tables of Intereſt, engraven on Copper Plates, 12ves.	00	02	06
Hiſtory of Tryals and Attainders, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Hutchinſon's Enquiry into our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, 8vo.	00	04	06
Hanover Tales: Or, The Secret Hiſtory of Count Fradonia, and the Unfortunate Beritia, 12ves.	00	01	06
Henley's Heſther, an Hiſtorical Poem	00	01	06
Horatius in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	06	06
Haywood's Novels, 4 Vols. 12ves.	00	10	00
Hook's Experiments, publiſh'd by Derham.	00	05	06
Hiſtoria Sacra: Or, Hiſtory of the Feaſts and Faſts of the Church of England.	00	05	00
Hope's Compleat Horſeman, Folio.	01	02	06
Howard's Plays, 12ves.	00	03	00
Hiſtory of Herodotus, Engliſh'd by Littlebury, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
The Hive: Or, A Collection of Songs, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	07	06
Hiſtory of the Devil, 8vo.	00	05	00

J

Johnſon's (Samuel) Works, Folio.	00	10	06
Jones's Poetical Miſcellanies, 12ves.	00	01	00
Juſtinius in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	05	06
Engliſh'd, by Brown, 12ves.	00	02	06
Jenks's Devotions on ſeveral Occaſions	00	03	00
Juvenalis in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	05	06
Jenkins of the Chriſtian Religion, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Journey through England, 3 Vols. 8vo.	00	15	00
Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, 8vo.	0	04	06

	l.	s.	d.
Jackman de vi Conſcientiæ, 12ves.	00	01	00
Independent Whig.	00	05	06
Ibbot's Sermons at Boyle's Lectures.	00	06	00
Jones's Canon of the New Teſtament, 3 Vols.	00	15	00
Jurieu's Devotions, 12ves.	00	02	06

K

KEttlewell's Works, 2 Vols. Folio. Moſt of his Pieces ſingle	02	00	00
King's (Biſhop) Inventions of Men in the Worſhip of God, 12ves.	00	01	06
Ken's (Bp.) Crown of Glory the Reward of the Righteous, 8vo.	00	02	06
Expoſition of the Church Catechiſm.	00	01	00
Kennet's Roman Antiquities, 8vo.	00	05	06
King's Heathen Gods, 12ves.	00	02	00
Keill's Introduction to Aſtronomy, Engliſh, 8vo.	00	06	00
King on the Creed, 8vo.	00	04	06
Conſtitutions of the Primitive Church.	00	04	06
Kidder, of the Meſſiah, Folio.	01	00	00
Key's Practical Meaſurer.	00	01	06
Keill's Introduction to Natural Philoſophy, 8vo.	00	04	06

L

LOCK's Works, 3 Vols. Folio.	02	15	00
of Human Underſtanding, 2 Vol.	00	09	00
of Education, 12ves.	00	02	06
of Government, 12ves.	00	03	00
Eſop's Fables Eng. and Latin, 8vo.	00	03	06
Leſtrange's Joſephus, Folio.	01	10	00
Æſop's Fables, 8vo.	00	06	00
Eraſmus, 8vo.	00	04	06
Littlebury's Tranſlation of Herodotus, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Ladies Travels into Spain, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	00
Lee's Tragedies, 3 Vols. 12ves	00	09	00
Lives of the Engliſh Poets, 2 Vol.	00	11	00
Leybourn's Dialling, Folio.	00	15	00
Dialling, abridg'd and improv'd, by Wilſon, 12ves.	00	03	00
Littleton's Dictionary, Engliſh and Latin.	00	16	00
Life of the Count de Vinevit, 12ves.	00	01	06
Madam de Beaumont, 12ves.	00	01	06
of Lucinda, 12ves.	00	01	06
of Charlotta Dupont, 12ves.	00	02	00
Ladies Library, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	09	00
Lewis's Origines Hebrææ, 4 Vols. 8vo.	01	00	00
Life of Signior Rozelli, 2 Vols. with Cuts.	00	09	00
Lamb's Cookery, 8vo.	00	06	00
Life of Oliver Cromwell, 8vo.	00	05	06
Law of Chriſtian Perfection, 8vo.	00	05	06
Love's Surveying, 8vo.	00	03	06
Lucas's Enquiry after Happineſs, 2 Vols.	00	10	00
Practical Chriſtianity.	00	03	06

M

MOLL's Compleat Geographer, Folio.	01	01	00
Moral Virtue delineated. Tranſlated from the French of Monſ. Gomberville	01	00	00
Manton on the 119th Pſalm, 1723.	01	00	00
Montfaucon's Travels into Italy, Folio.	00	18	00
Memoirs of Philip de Comines, 2 Vols. 8ve.	00	10	00

	l.	s.	d.
Memoirs of Anne of Auſtria, 5 Vols. 12ves.	00	15	00
Moyle's Works, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	11	00
Montaigne's Eſſays, 3 Vols. 8vo.	00	15	00
Miſſon's Travels over England, 8vo.	00	04	06
Mauger's French Grammar, 8vo.	00	02	00
Martial in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	06	06
Miſcellanea Aurea: Or, Golden Medley.	00	04	00
Medulla Hiſtoriæ Anglicanæ, 8vo.	00	06	00
Motteaux's Don Quixot, 4 Vol. 12ves.	00	10	00
Morgan's Principles of Medicine, 8vo.	00	05	00
Moreland's Vade Mecum, 8vo.	00	02	00
Maſter-Key to Popery, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	09	00
Milbourn's Legacy to the Church of England, 2 Vols.	00	09	00
Mandey, of Meaſuring, 8vo.	00	05	00
Maſhmer's Husbandry, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	09	00
Mangey, on the Lord's Prayer, 8vo.	00	03	06
Muſæ Anglicanæ, 2 Vols.	00	05	06
Moor (Biſhop of Ely) his Sermons, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	09	00

N

NIcholls's Conference with a Theiſt, 2 Vols. with large Additions, 8vo.	00	10	00
New Voyage round the World by a Courſe never ſail'd before, 8vo.	00	04	06
Nelſon's (Robert) Works, Abridg'd and Methodiz'd, 2 Vol. 12ves.	00	06	00
Noble Slaves, a Novel, 12ves.	00	02	00
New Miſcellaneous Poems, with Five Love Letters from a Nun to a Cavalier, and the Cavalier's Anſwer, in Verſe.	00	02	00
Nelſon of the Feaſts and Faſts of the Church of England.	00	05	00
Practice of true Devotion, 12ves.	00	02	06
New Manual of Devotions, in 3 Parts.	00	03	00
Nuptial Dialogues and Debates, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Nelſon's Abridgment of the Law, 3 Vols. Folio.	04	10	00

O

OZanam's Courſe of the Mathematicks. Done from the French by Dr. Deſaguliers, and others, 5 Vols. 8vo.	01	02	06
Ovidii Metamorphoſes in Uſum Delphini.	00	06	06
Tranſlated into Engliſh Verſe, and publiſh'd by Dr. Sewell, 2 Vols.	00	05	06
Osborn's Works, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Oſtervald's Cauſes of the Corruption of Chriſtians.	00	04	06
Orleans's Hiſtory of the Stuarts, recommended by Echard, 8vo.	00	04	06
Ovid De Triſtibus in Engliſh Verſe	00	01	00
Ogilby's and Morgan's Pocket Book of the Roads, 8vo.	00	01	06
Ovid's Epiſtles, Engliſh, with Cuts, 12ves.	00	03	00
Art of Love, with Cuts, 12ves.	00	03	00
Oldham's Works, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	00

P

PHilips's Engliſh Dictionary, Folio.	01	00	00
Patrick's (Bp.) Devout Chriſtian Inſtructed, 12ves.	00	03	00
Chriſtian Sacrifice, 12ves.	00	03	00
Menſa Myſtica, 8vo.	00	05	00
Sermons, on Contentment, 8vo.	00	05	00
Help to Young Communicants, 24°	00	00	06
Patrick's (Dr.) Pſalms, 12ves.	00	02	00
Potter's (Biſhop) Greek Antiquities, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	12	00
Pembroke's Arcadia, 3 Vols. by Sir Philip Sidney, 1725.	00	13	06

	l.	s.	d.
Puffendorf's Introduction to the Hiſtory of Europe, 8vo.	00	06	00
Pomfret's Poems, 12ves.	00	02	00
Plurality of Worlds. Tranſlated from the French of Fontenell. By Gardner.	00	02	06
Poſtman robb'd of his Mail: Or, A Collection of Letters, written by the beſt Wits of the preſent Age, 12ves.	00	03	00
Prior's Poems, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Parnell's Poems, 8vo.	00	03	06
Pope's Homer's Iliad, 6 Vols. 12ves. with Cuts.	00	18	00
Odiſſey, in 5 Vol. 12ves.	00	15	00
Miſcellanies, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Prideaux's Connection of the Old and New Teſtament, 4 Vols. 8vo.	01	00	00
Life of Mahomet, 8vo.	00	03	06
Palladio's Architecture, 4to.	00	04	00
Pomet's Hiſtory of Druggs, 4to.	01	01	00
Perſian Tales, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	09	00
Patrick's (Biſhop) Paraphraſe on all the Poetical Books of the Old Teſtament.	00	18	00
Commentary on the Hiſtorical Books of the Bible, 2 Vols. Folio.	02	08	00
Pearſon, on the Creed, Folio.	00	12	00
Pitt's (Rev. Mr.) Poems on ſeveral Occaſions.	00	03	06

Q

QUarles's Emblems, 12ves.	00	04	00
Divine Poems, 12ves.	00	03	00
Queen's Cloſet open'd, 12ves.	00	02	00
Quincy's Pharm. Officinalis, 8vo.	00	06	00
Lexicon Medicum, 8vo.	00	05	06
Sanctorius Aphoriſms, 8vo.	00	05	06
Quintus Curtius. 2 Vols. Engliſh.	00	06	00

R

ROW's Callipœdia, 12ves.	00	01	06
Richardſon of Painting, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Robinſon (Dr.) on the Stone and Gravel, 8vo.	00	04	00
on Conſumptions, 8vo.	00	04	00
Royal French Grammar.	00	02	06
Robert's (Capt.) Voyages to the Cape de Verd Iſlands.	00	05	00
Ray's Wiſdom of God in the Creation.	00	04	06
Phyſico-Theological Diſcourſes, 8vo.	00	05	06
Ratcliff's Life, 12ves.	00	01	06
Religious Philoſopher, 2 Vols. 4to.	00	16	00
Reflections on Ridicule, 2 Vols.	00	05	00
Ronayne's Algebra, 8vo.	00	06	00
Row's Lucan's Pharſalia, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	06	00
Salluſt, Engliſh	00	02	06

S

SElden's Works, 6 Vols. Publiſh'd by Dr. Wilkins	07	16	00
Stevens's Engliſh and Spaniſh Dictionary.	01	01	00
Stanhope (Dr.) on the Epiſtles and Goſpels, 4 Vols. 8vo.	01	02	00
Sherlock (Dr.) of Death, 8vo.	00	03	06
The ſame in 12ves.	00	01	06
on Judgment, 8vo.	00	04	00
on a Future State, 8vo.	00	04	06
on Providence, 8vo.	00	04	06
of Religious Aſſemblies, 8vo.	00	04	00

	l.	s.	d.
Sherlock's (Dr.) Sermons, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	09	00
Secret Hiſtory of Whitehall, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	06
Select Novels, 2 Vols. with Cuts, 12ves.	00	06	00
Strother's Pharm. Practica, 12ves.	00	03	06
Sydenham's (Dr.) Works Engliſh, 8vo.	00	04	06
Scrivener's Guide, 2 Vol. 8vo.	00	11	00
Salmon's Family Dictionary, 8vo.	00	06	00
Smith's Art of Painting in Oil, 12ves.	00	01	00
Symſon's New Voyage to the Weſt Indies.	00	03	06
South's Maxims, 8vo.	00	01	06
Sylvius de la Bore's Practical Phyſick, 8vo.	00	04	00
Salluſtius in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	04	00
Schrevelii Lexicon, 8vo.	00	06	06
Spectator, 8 Vols.	01	00	00
Seneca's Morals. By Sir R. Leſtrange, 8vo.	00	05	00
Stanhope's (Dr.) Chriſtian Pattern, 8vo.	00	04	06
Parſons Chriſtian Directory.	00	04	06
St. Auſtin's Meditations.	00	04	06
Epictetus's Morals, 8vo.	00	04	06
Salmon's Druggiſt Shop open'd, 8vo.	00	07	06
Suetonius, Engliſh, 2 Vols.	00	05	00
Spinke's Sick Man viſited, 8vo.	00	05	00
Steel's (Sir Richard) Plays.	00	03	00
Southern's Plays, 2 Vol.	00	06	00
Strother's Eſſay on Health, 8vo.	00	05	06
Salmon's Review of the Hiſtory of England, 2 Vols.	00	10	00
againſt Burnet's Hiſtory, 2 Vols.	00	10	00
Eſſay on Marriage.	00	04	06
Shaw's Practice of Phyſick, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	09	00
Tranſlation of Boerhave's Chymiſtry.	00	18	00
Sutherland's Ship-Building unveil'd, Folio.	00	15	00
Sydenham's Practice of Phyſick, Engliſh.	00	05	06
Shaftsbury's Characteriſticks, 3 Vols.	00	18	00
Stanhope's (Dr.) 12 Sermons on ſeveral Occaſions, 8vo.	00	05	06
Swinden's Enquiry into the Place of Hell.	00	05	06
South's Sermons, 6 Vols. 8vo.	01	10	00
Shaw's Edinburgh Diſpenſatory.	00	04	00
Sharp's Sermons, 4 Vols.	00	18	00

T

TAylor's (Bp.) Life of Chriſt, now in the Preſs.			
Rules for Holy Living and Dying.	00	05	00
Contemplations on the State of Man.	00	02	06
Golden Grove, 12ves.	00	01	00
Tyrrel's Bibliotheca Politica, Folio.	00	18	00
Tournfort's Voyage into the Levant, 2 Vols. 4to.	01	10	00
Tatler, 5 Vols. 12ves.	00	12	06
Tacitus, Engliſh, 3 Vols. 12ves.	00	09	00
Terentius in Uſum Delphini, 8vo.	00	05	06
Engliſh'd by Echard, 12ves.	00	02	06
Travels of an Engliſh Gentleman from London to Rome on Foot, 12ves.	00	01	06
Turretin of Fundamental Principles in Religion, 8vo.	00	01	00
Turner's Surgery, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	11	00
Diſeaſes of the Skin, 8vo.	00	05	06
Syphilis, 8vo.	00	04	06
Temple's Works, 2 Vols. Folio.	01	12	00
Tillotſon's (Biſhop) Works, 3 Vols. Folio.	02	10	00
Tale of a Tub, 12ves. with Cuts.	00	02	06

	I.	s.	d.
V			
VAuban, of Fortification, 8vo.	00	06	00
Vida's Art of Poetry, in Engliſh, 12ves.	00	02	00
Vertot's Revolutions of Rome, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
of Sweden, 8vo.	00	04	06
of Portugal, 8vo.	00	03	00
Vanbrugh's (Sir John) Plays, 2 Vols.	00	05	00
W			
WHeatley on the Common Prayer, Folio.	00	18	00
Whitby, on the New Teſtament, 2 Vols.	02	02	00
Diſquiſitiones Modeſtæ, 8vo.	00	03	00
Ward's London Spy, in 6 Vols. 8vo.	01	07	06
N. B. Moſt of the Pieces may be had ſingle.			
Nuptial Dialogues 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	06	00
Webſter's Arithmetick in Epitome, 12ves.	00	02	06
Book-keeping, 8vo.	00	01	06
Wycherley's Plays, 2 Vols. 12ves.	00	05	00
Ward's Young Mathematician's Guide.	00	06	00
Woodward's Eſſay towards a Natural Hiſtory of the Earth, 8vo.	00	04	00
Wiſeman's Surgery, 2 Vols. 8vo.	00	10	00
Week's Preparation to the Sacrament, 12ves.	00	01	00
Wood's Inſtitutes of the Common Law, Folio.	01	04	00
of the Civil and Imperial Law, 8vo.	00	06	00
Wake's (Abp.) Genuine Epiſtles.	00	05	06
Commentary on the Church Catechiſm.	00	02	00
Warder's Monarchy of Bees, 8vo.	00	01	06
Well's Sacred Geography of the Old and New Teſtament, 8vo. 4 Vols.	01	00	00
Courſe of the Mathematicks, 3 Vols. 8vo.	00	18	00
Watts's Aſtronomy, 8vo.	00	04	06
Logick, 8vo.	00	04	06
Sermons, 3 Vol. 12ves.	00	09	00
Pſalms, 12ves.	00	01	06
Wingate's Arithmetick, 8vo.	00	04	06
Y			
YOUNG Clerk's Tutor, 12ves.	00	01	06
Young, (Dr.) on the Laſt Day, 12ves.	00	01	00
Poem on Lady Jane Gray, 8vo.	00	01	00

Libri in Uſum Scholarum.

BAiley's Ovid's Metamorphoſis, 8vo.
Ovid De Triſtibus, 12ves.
Phædrus, 8vo.
Cato, 12ves.
Exerciſes, Engliſh and Latin, 12ves.
Exercitia Latina: Or, Latin for Garretſon's Exerciſes, 12ves.
Busby's Greek Grammar, 8vo.
Engliſh Introduction to the Latin Tongue.
Syntaxis Eraſmiana Conſtrictior, 8vo.
Ditto, Conſtrued, 8vo.
Beza's Latin Teſtament, 12ves and 24o.

Clavis Homerica, 8vo.
Clark's Introduction to the making of Latin
Florus, 8vo.
Nepos, 8vo.
Eutropius, 8vo. } All with Literal
Erasmus, 12ves. } Translations.
Corderius 12ves. }
Castalio's Latin Bible, in 4 neat Vols.
Latin Testament, 12ves.
Cornelius Nepos, 12ves.
Cesar, 12ves.
Demosthenes, 12ves
Dyche's Vocabulary, 8vo.
Youth's Guide to the Latin Tongue, 12ves.
English Particles Latiniz'd, 8vo.
Phædrus, 12ves.
Electa Majora, 8vo.
Minora, 8vo.
Eutropius, 12ves.
Epigrammatum Delectus, 12ves.
Erasmus, Dublin, 12ves.
Familiar Form, 12ves.
Farnaby's Rhetorick, 8vo. English and Latin.
Garretson's English Exercises, 12ves.
Gradus ad Parnassum, 8vo.
Gregory's Nomenclatura, 8vo.
Hederici Lexicon, 4to.
Homeri Ilias, Greek and Latin, 8vo.
Helvici Colloquia, 12ves.
Hoadley's Phædrus, 12ves.
Horace, 12ves. sine Notis.
King's Heathen Gods, 12ves.
Lock's Æsop Interlineary, English and Latin.
Leed's Greek Grammar, 12ves.
London Vocabulary, by Greenwood, 12ves.
Leusden's Compendium, 8vo.
Martialis Epigrammata, 12ves.
More's English Examples, for the Use of Bury School, 8vo.
Pantheon. By Tooke, 8vo. with Cuts.
Phædrus Delphini, 8vo.
Ray's Nomenclatura. 8vo.
Royal Grammar, 12ves.
Urmston's Help to the Accidence, 8vo.
London Spelling Book, 12ves.
Walker's Art of Teaching, 12ves.
Engl. Examples, 12ves.
Particles, 8vo.
Wettenhall's Gr. Grammar, 12ves.
Well's Dionysius, 8vo.
Ware's Practical Grammar, 8vo.
Xenophon de Cyri Institutione, Greek and Latin.

Most of the Classicks in Usum Delphini.

BOOKS lately publiſh'd.

I. THE Entertaining Novels of Mrs. Jane Barker. Containing, 1. Exilius: Or, The Baniſh'd Roman. 2. Clelia and Marcellus: Or, The Conſtant Lovers. 3. The Reward of Virtue: Or, The Adventures of Clarinthia and Lyſander. 4. The Lucky Eſcape: Or, The Fate of Iſmenus. 5. Clodius and Scipiana: Or, The Beautiful Captive. 6. Piſo: Or, The Leud Courtier. 7. The Happy Recluſe: Or, The Charms of Liberty. 8. The Fair Widow: Or, Falſe Friend. 9. The Amours of Boſvill and Galeſia. The 2d. Edition. In 2 Vols. Price 5s.

II. A Patchwork Screen for the Ladies: Or, Love and Virtue recommended, in a Collection of Inſtructive Novels, related after a Manner entirely New, and interſpers'd with Rural Poems, deſcribing the Innocence of a Country Life. Price 2s. 6d.

III. A Lining for the Patchwork Screen: Deſigned for the farther Entertainment of the Ladies. Price 2s. 6d. Theſe Two by Mrs. Barker.

IV. The Life of Charlotta du Pont, an Engliſh Lady, taken from her own Memoirs: Giving an Account how ſhe was trapann'd by her Step-Mother to Virginia; how the Ship was taken by ſome Madagaſcar Pyrates, and retaken by a Spaniſh Man of War; of her Marriage in the Spaniſh Weſt-Indies, and Adventures while ſhe reſided there, with her Return to England; and the Hiſtory of ſeveral Gentlemen and Ladies whom ſhe met withal in her Travels, ſome of whom had been Slaves in Barbary, and others caſt on Shore on the Barbarous Coaſts up the great River Oroonoque; with their Eſcape thence, and ſafe Return to France and Spain. A Hiſtory that contains the greateſt Variety of Events ever yet publiſh'd. By Mrs. Aubin. Price 2s.

V. The Tragical Hiſtory of the Chevalier de Vaudray and the Counteſs de Vergi. In Two Parts. To which is annex'd a ſhort Novel, entitled, The Inhuman Husband. Done from the French by Mr. Morgan. Price 2s.

VI. The Agreeable Variety: Being a miſcellaneous Collection in Proſe and Verſe, from the Works of the moſt Celebrated Authors. In Two Parts, viz. Part I. Containing Inſtructive Diſcourſes on the moſt uſeful Subjects, for the happy Conduct of human Life. 2. Characters of the moſt Illuſtrious Perſonages of both Sexes, of our own, and other Nations, particularly the remarkable Manner of Life of the excellent Princeſs of Parma. Written by herſelf, and found among her Papers after her Deceaſe. 3. Choice Poems, and Select Paſſages, extracted from the moſt Celebrated Poets. Part II. Containing Original Poems; Sixty familiar Letters upon Education, Love, Friendſhip, &c. none of which ever before Publiſh'd. The Whole Collected and Publiſh'd by a Lady. Price 3s. 6d. The 2d Edition.

VII. Miſcellanea Aurea: Or, The Golden Medley. Conſiſting of, 1. A Voyage to the Mountains of the Moon, under the Æquator: Or, Parnaſſus reform'd. 2. The Fortunate Ship-wreck: Or, A Deſcription of New Athens, being an Account of the Laws, Manners, Religion, and Cuſtoms of that Country. By Morris Williams, Gent. who reſided there above twenty Years. 3. Alberoni: Or, A Vindication of that Cardinal. 4. The Secret Hiſtory of the Amours of Don Alonzo Duke of Lerma, and Grandee of Spain. 5. The Garden of Adonis: Or, Love to no Purpoſe; being about twenty Copies of Verſes and Love Letters. By a Lady. 6. Mahomet no Impoſtor; written in Arabick, by Abdulla-Mahunied Omer. 7. An Account of Bad and Good Women, antient and modern. With ſeveral other Epiſtolary Eſſays in Proſe and Verſe. By Mr. Milton; the Lady W-----, Mr. Philips, and ſeveral Others. In Octavo. Price 4s.

VIII. The

VIII. The four Years Voyage of Captain George Roberts: Being a Series of uncommon Events, which befel him in a Voyage to the Iſlands of the Canaries, Cape de Verde, and Barbadoes, from whence he was bound to the Coaſt of Guinea; the Manner of his being taken by three Pirate Ships, Commanded by Low, Ruſſel,, and Spriggs, who after having plundered him, and detained him ten Days, put him aboard his own Sloop without Proviſions, Water, &c. and with only two Boys, one of eighteen, and the other of eight Years of Age; the Hardſhips he endured for above twenty Days, till he arriv'd at the Iſland of St. Nicholas, from whence he was blown off to Sea (before he could get any Suſtenance) without his biggeſt Boy and Boat, whom he had ſent aſhore; and after four Days Difficulty and Diſtreſs, was Ship-wreck'd on the unfrequented Iſland of St. John; where, after he had remained near two Years, he built a Veſſel to bring himſelf off. With a particular and curious Deſcription and Draught of the Cape de Verd Iſlands, their Roads, anchoring Places, Nature and Production of the Soil; the Kindneſs and Hoſpitality of the Natives to Strangers, their Religion, Manners, Cuſtoms, and Superſtitions, &c. Together with Obſervations on the Minerals, Mineral Waters, Metals, and Salts, and of the Nitre, with which ſome of thoſe Iſlands abound. Written by himſelf now living at Shad-Thames, 1726. Price 5 s.

IX. The Travels of an Engliſh Gentleman from London to Rome on Foot: Containing a Comical Deſcription of what he met with Remarkable in every City, Town, and Religious Houſe, in his whole Journey: Alſo an Account of their ridiculous Proceſſions, and Ceremonies, in their Churches, through their Streets, and in the Woods. Likewiſe the Debauch'd Lives, and Amorous Intriegues of the Prieſts and Nuns: With a pleaſant Account of the Opening the Holy Gate of St. Peter's Church. Alſo Reflections upon the Superſtition and Foppiſh Pageantry of the whole Ceremony of the laſt Grand Jubilee at Rome. The 4th Edition. Now Publiſh'd for the Diverſion and Information of the Proteſtants of England. Price 1 s. 6 d.

X. Saduciſſimus Triumphatus: Or, A full and plain Evidence concerning Witches and Apparitions. In Two Parts. The Firſt treating of their Poſſibility; the Second of their real Exiſtence. By Joſeph Glanvill, Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles II. and F. R. S. The 4th Edition, with Additions. With ſome Account of Mr. Glanvill's Life and Writings. Price 6 s. 1726.

XI. The Works of the Honourable Sir Philip Sidney, Knt. In Proſe and Verſe. Containing, 1. The Counteſs of Pembroke's Arcadia. 2. The Defence of Poeſy. 3. Aſtrophel and Stella. 4. The Remedy of Love. 5. The Lady of May: A Maſque. 6. The Life of the Author. The 14th Edition. In Three Vols. 8vo. 1725. Price 13 s. 6 d.

XII. The New Deſcription and Preſent State of the Kingdom of France: Containing, 1. An Hiſtorical Account of its Kings, their Antiquity, Prerogatives, &c. With a Deſcription of all the Royal Palaces, and of the Paintings, Statues, and other Curioſities therein contained. 2. Of the Parliament, and all Officers, Civil and Military, belonging to his Majeſty, and the Princes of the Blood. 3. Of the Biſhopricks, other Church Dignities, Monaſteries, and Clergy; of the Univerſities, Faculties therein ſtudied, and of the French Academy. 4. The Peerage of France; the three Orders of Knighthood; the Nobility and Marſhals; and the Coats of Arms of each reſpective Family truly Emblazoned. 5. A Deſcription of the City of Paris, and all the Publick Buildings, Churches, Libraries, and Collection of Rarities, and whatſoever elſe is remarkable. 6. The Roads from one Town to another, with the exact Diſtances from Place to Place, not only in France, but from thence through Spain, Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands. In Two Volumes, 12vo. The 2d Edition, 1726. Price 6 s.

XIII. Mechanical

XIII. Mechanical Essays on the Animal Oeconomy; wherein not only the Conduct of Nature in Animal Secretion, but Sensation and human Generation, are distinctly consider'd, and Anatomically explain'd; as also the particular Manner of the Operation of a Medicine is accounted for, and many other Curious and Uncommon Subjects are treated of; necessary for all that study Nature, and particularly those that make Physick or Surgery their Practice. By James Handley, Surgeon, Author of Colloquia Chirurgica, 8vo. Price 5 s.

XIV. England's Interest: Or, The Gentleman and Farmer's Friend: Shewing 1. How Land may be improv'd from 20s. to 8 l. and so to 100 l. per Acre, per Annum, with great Ease, and for an inconsiderable Charge. 2. The best and quickest Way of raising a Nursery. 3. How to make Cyder, Perry, Cherry, Currant, Gooseberry, Mulberry, and Birch Wines, as Strong and Wholsome as French and Spanish Wines; and the Cyders and Wines so made to be sold at 3 d. per Quart, tho' as good as Wine now sold for 18 d. 4. Directions for Brewing the finest Malt Liquors, better and cheaper than hitherto known. 5. Instructions for Breeding Horses, Husbandry of Bees, and ordering Fish and Fish-Ponds. Lastly, Physick for Families; containing many useful Medicines for several Distempers, particularly the Plague. By Sir J. Moore, 12ves. Price 1 s. 6 d.

XV. English Liberties: Or, The Free-born Subject's Inheritance. Containing Magna Charta, Charta de Foresta, the Statute de Tallagio non Concedendo, the Habeas Corpus Act; with several other Statutes, and Comments on each of them: Likewise the Proceedings in Appeals of Murder, of Ship-Money, of Tunnage and Poundage, of Parliaments, of the Three Estates, and of the Settlement of the Crown by Parliament. Together with a short History of the Succession, not by any Hereditary Right; also a Declaration of the Liberty of the Subject, the Petition of Right; with a short, but impartial Relation of the Difference between King Charles I. and the Long Parliament; of Tryals by Juries, and of the Qualifications of Jurors, their Punishment for Misbehaviour, and of Challenges to them. Lastly, Of Justices of the Peace, Coroners, Constables, Church-Wardens, Overseers of the Poor, Surveyors of the Highway, &c. With many Law-Cases throughout the Whole. Compiled first by Henry Care, and now continued with large Additions. By W. Nelson, of the Middle-Temple, Esq; The 4th Edition. Price 4 s. 6 d.

XVI. A Crown of Glory, the Reward of the Righteous: Being Meditations upon the Vicissitude and Uncertainty of all Sublunary Enjoyments, viz. 1. Honour, Riches, and Pleasure. 2. The Nature and Cause of Afflictions. 3. The great Benefit of Afflictions. 4. Of our Resignation to the Will of God. To which is added, A Manual of Devotions for Times of Trouble and Affliction; also Meditations and Prayers for the Holy Communion, both before, at, and after receiving; with some general Rules and Directions for our Daily Practice. Compos'd for the Use of a Noble Family. By the Right Reverend Dr. Thomas Kenn, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. Price 2 s. 6 d.

XVII. The Devout Christian's Hourly Companion: Consisting of Holy Prayers, and Divine Meditations. Done into English from that Spiritual Drexelius. The 3d Edition, in 12ves. Price 1 s.

XVIII. The Gentleman Angler: Containing short, plain, and easy Instructions, whereby the most ignorant Beginner may, in a little Time, become a perfect Artist in Angling for Salmon, Salmon-Peal, Trout, Pike, Carp, Perch, Barbell, Tench, Bream, Chub, Greyling, Mullets, Flounders, Roach, Dace, Gudgeon, &c. With several Observations on Angling, Angle-Rods, and Artificial Flies; how to choose the best Hair, and Indian Grass; of the proper Times and Seasons for River and Pond Fishing. To which is added, The Angler's new Song, the Laws of Angling, and the Form of a

Licence

Licence and Deputation for Angling. Together with an Appendix : Containing the Method of Rock and Sea Fishing; an Explanation of Technical Words used in the Art of Angling; choice Receipts for dressing Fish; and how to improve Barren Ground, by turning it into Fish-Ponds. By a Gentleman, who made Angling his Diversion upwards of twenty eight Years, 1726. Price 1 s. 6 d.

XIX. A Practical Discourse of Religious Assemblies, under the following Heads : 1. Of Religion in general. 2. What Religious Worship is. 3. Of Publick Worship, and the Danger of forsaking Publick Assemblies. 4. The Seasonableness of this Discourse. 5. Concerning Speculative Atheists. 6. The Inclination of Human Nature to Religious Worship. 7. Atheists should not wholly forsake Religious Assemblies. 8. Nor intermeddle in the Disputes of Religion. 9. Concerning the Practical Atheist. 10. The Danger of Irreligion, both with respect to this World and the next. 11. Concerning Parochial Communion. 12. Concerning the Neglect of the Publick Prayers of the Church. 13. Concerning the great Neglect of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By William Sherlock, D. D. late Dean of St. Paul's. The 4th Edition, 1726. Price 4 s.

XX. Spiritual Communion Recommended and Enforced from Scripture, from the Primitive Fathers and Councils, from Reason, and from Experience, in an Examination and Defence of the Doctrine, Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church of England. In Two Parts. By a Lay Hand, 8vo. 1725. Price 2 s. 6 d.

XXI. Arithmetick in the Plainest and most Concise Method hitherto extant; with new Improvements for Dispatch of Business in all the several Rules; as also Fractions, Vulgar and Decimal, wrought together after a new Method that renders both easy to be understood in their Nature and Use. The Whole perused and approved of by the most Eminent Accomptants in the several Offices of the Revenue, viz. Customs, Excise, &c. as the only Book of its Kind, for Variety of Rules, and Brevity of Work. By Geo. Fisher, Accomptant. The 2d Edition, with large Additions and Improvements, 12ves. 1725. Price 2 s. 6 d.

XXII. A new Method of treating Consumptions; wherein all the Decays incident to Human Bodies are mechanically accounted for, with some Considerations, touching the Difference between Consumptions, and those Decays that naturally attend Old Age. To which are added, Arguments in Defence of the Possibility of curing Ulcers in the Lungs; as also Reasons demonstrating that the irregular Discharges of all the Evacuations in Consumptions, arise from the Resistance of the Heart not decaying in a simple Proportion to the Resistance of the other Parts. 8vo. Price 5 s.

XXIII. A compleat Treatise of the Gravel and Stone, with all their Causes, Symptoms and Cures accounted for. To which are added, Propositions demonstrating that the Stone may be safely dissolved without any Detriment to the Body, drawn from Reason, Experiments, and Anatomical Observations. The 2d Edition, with large Additions. 8vo. Price 4 s. These two by Nicholas Robinson, M. D.

XXIV. An Essay towards a Natural History of the Earth, and Terrestrial Bodies, especially Minerals; as also of the Sea, Rivers, and Springs : With an Account of the Universal Deluge, and of the Effects it had on the Earth. By John Woodward, M D. Professor of Physick in Gresham College. The 3d Edition. Price 4 s.

XXV. The

XXV. The Demonſtration of True Religion, in a Chain of Conſequences from certain and undeniable Principles; wherein the Neceſſity and Certainty of Natural and Revealed Religion, with the Nature and Reaſon of both are proved and explained; and in particular the Authority of the Chriſtian Revelation is eſtabliſhed, not only from the Natures and Reaſons of Things, but alſo from the Relation it bears to the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament. In 16 Sermons preached at Bow Church in the Years 1724, and 1725, for the Lecture founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle, Eſq; In two Volumes, 8vo. Price 9 s.

XXVI. An Eſſay upon Government: Or, The Natural Notions of Government, demonſtated in a Chain of Conſequences from the fundamental Principles of Society. By which all the niceſt Caſes of Conſcience relating to Government, may be, and many of them are here reſolved, with reſpect to the Authority of Government in general, the End and Manner of making and executing Laws, the Meaſures of Submiſſion to Princes, and the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of Revolutions; in a Method altogether new. Price 1 s. 6d. The two laſt by Thomas Burnett, D. D. Prebendary of Sarum, and Rector of Weſthington in Wiltſhire.

PLAYS, on Elziver Letter, at One Shilling each.

A Bramule,
All for Love,
Anatomiſt,
Ambitious Stepmother,
Artful Husband,
Artful Wife,
Beaux's Stratagem,
Beaux's Duel,
Beggar's Buſh,
Biter,
Boarding School,
Bold Strike for a Wife.
Briton,
Buſiris,
Buſy Body,
Caius Marius,
Campaign,
Careleſs Husband,
Cato,
Chances,
Committee,
Conſcious Lovers,
Country Wife,
Sir Courtly Nice,
Cruel Gift,
Devil of a Wife,
Diſtreſs'd Mother,
Don Sebaſtian,
Double Gallant,
Drummer,
Duke of Glouceſter,
Earl of Eſſex,
Æſop,
Fair Penitent,
Fair Quaker of Deal,
Fall of Saguntum,
Fatal Marriage,
Gameſter,
Hamlet,
Hob,
Humours of Purgatory,
Jane Shore,
Jane Gray,
Inconſtant,
Ignoramus,
Iſland Princeſs,
King Lear,
London Cuckolds,
Love and a Bottle,
Love for Money,
Love makes a Man,
Love's laſt Shift,
Mariamne,
Meaſure for Meaſure,
Merry Wives of Windſor,
Northern Heireſs,
Northern Laſs,
Oroonoko,
Orphan,
Othello,
Phædra and Hippolitus,
Pilgrim,
Plain Dealer,
Provok'd Wife,
Recruiting Officer,
Rehearſal and Chances,
Relapſe,
Revenge,
Royal Convert,
Rule a Wife,
She Gallant,
Sauney the Scot,
She wou'd and ſhe wou'd'nt,
She wou'd if ſhe cou'd,
Siege of Damaſcus,
Sophonisba,
Spartan Dame,
'Squire of Alſatia,
Tamerlane,
Theodoſius,
Tunbridge Wells,
Twin-Rivals,
Venice preſerv'd,
Ulyſſes,
Sir Walter Raleigh,
Wife's Excuſe.
Wonder.

With great Variety of Plays, Poetry, Novels, &c.